

A Dichotomy Theorem for the Approximate Counting of Complex-Weighted Bounded-Degree Boolean CSPs*

TOMOYUKI YAMAKAMI[†]

Abstract: We determine the computational complexity of approximately counting the total weight of variable assignments for every complex-weighted Boolean constraint satisfaction problem (or CSP) with any number of additional unary (i.e., arity 1) constraints, particularly, when degrees of input instances are bounded from above by a fixed constant. All degree-1 counting CSPs are obviously solvable in polynomial time. When the instance's degree is more than two, we present a dichotomy theorem that classifies all counting CSPs admitting free unary constraints into exactly two categories. This classification theorem extends, to complex-weighted problems, an earlier result on the approximation complexity of unweighted counting Boolean CSPs of bounded degree. The framework of the proof of our theorem is based on a theory of signature developed from Valiant's holographic algorithms that can efficiently solve seemingly intractable counting CSPs. Despite the use of arbitrary complex weight, our proof of the classification theorem is rather elementary and intuitive due to an extensive use of a novel notion of limited T-constructibility. For the remaining degree-2 problems, in contrast, they are as hard to approximate as Holant problems, which are a generalization of counting CSPs.

Keywords: constraint satisfaction problem, #CSP, bounded degree, approximate counting, dichotomy theorem, T-constructibility, signature, Holant problem

1 Bounded-Degree Boolean #CSPs

Our general objective is to determine the approximation complexity[‡] of constraint satisfaction problems (or CSPs) whose instances consist of *variables* (on certain domains) and *constraints*, which describe “relationships” among the variables. Such CSPs have found numerous applications in graph theory, database theory, and artificial intelligence as well as statistical physics. A *decision CSP*, for instance, asks whether or not, for two given sets of variables and of constraints, any assignment that assigns actual values in the domain to the variables satisfies all the constraints simultaneously. The *satisfiability problem* (SAT) of deciding the existence of a satisfying truth assignment for a given Boolean formula is a typical example of the decision CSPs. Since input instances are often restricted to particular types of constraints (where a set of these constraints is known as a *constraint language*), it seems natural to parameterize CSPs in terms of a given set $\mathcal{F}$ of allowable constraints. Conventionally, such a parameterized CSP is expressed as $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{F})$. Schaefer's [17] dichotomy theorem classifies all such parametrized $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{F})$'s into exactly two categories: polynomial-time solvable problems (i.e., in P) and NP-complete problems, provided that NP is different from P. This situation highlights structural simplicity of the $\text{CS}(\mathcal{F})$'s, because all NP problems, by contrast, fill up infinitely many categories [16].

In the course of a study of CSPs, various restrictions have been imposed on constraints as well as variables. Of all such restrictions, recently there has been a great interest in a particular type of restriction, of which each individual variable should not appear more than d times in the scope of all given constraints. The maximal number of such d on any instance is called the *degree* of the instance. This degree has played a key role in a discussion of the complexity of CSPs; for instance, the *planar read-trice satisfiability problem*, which comprised of logical formulas of degree at most three, is known to be NP-complete, while the *planar read-twice satisfiability problem*, whose degree is two, falls into P. Those CSPs whose instances have their degrees upper-bounded are referred to as *bounded-degree* CSPs. Under the assumption that unary constraints are freely available as part of input instances, Dalmau and Ford [7], for example, showed that, for certain cases of $\mathcal{F}$, the complexity of solving $\text{CSP}(\mathcal{F})$ remains unchanged even if all instances are restricted to degree at most three. Notice that such a free use of unary constraints were frequently made in the past literature (see, e.g., [7, 11, 13, 14]) to draw stronger and more concise results.

*A preliminary version appeared under a slightly different title in the Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Combinatorial Optimization and Applications (COCO 2010), Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, Vol.6508 (Part I), pp.285–299, Kailua-Kona, Hawaii, USA, December 18–20, 2010.

[†]Current Affiliation: Department of Information Science, University of Fukui, 3-9-1 Bunkyo, Fukui 910-8507, Japan

[‡]We use this term to mean the computational complexity of approximately solving a given problem.

Apart from those decision CSPs, a *counting CSP* (or $\#CSP$, in short) asks how many variable assignments satisfy the set of given constraints. In parallel to Schaefer’s theorem, Creignou and Herman [5] gave their dichotomy theorem on the computational complexity of Boolean $\#CSP$ s. Their result was later extended by Dyer, Goldberg, and Jerrum [12] to non-negative weighted Boolean $\#CSP$ s and then further extended to complex-weighted Boolean $\#CSP$ s by Cai, Lu, and Xia [3]. Cai et al. also studied the complexity of complex-weighted Boolean $\#CSP$ s whose maximal degree does not exceed three. Those remarkable results are meant for the computational complexity of “exact counting.” From a perspective of “approximate counting,” on the contrary, Dyer, Goldberg, and Jerrum [13] showed a classification theorem on the approximate counting of the number of variable assignments for unweighted Boolean CSPs, parametrized by the choice of constraint set $\mathcal{F}$, under a notion of *approximation-preserving (or AP) reducibility*. This theorem, however, is quite different from the earlier dichotomy theorems for the exact-counting of Boolean CSPs; in fact, the theorem classifies all Boolean $\#CSP$ s into three categories, including an intermediate level located between a class of P-computable problems and a class of $\#P$ -complete problems.

The degree bound of input instances to $\#CSP$ s has drawn an unmistakable picture in a discussion on the approximation complexity of the $\#CSP$ s by Dyer, Goldberg, Jalsenius, and Richerby [11]. They discovered the following approximation-complexity classification of unweighted Boolean $\#CSP$ s when their degrees are further bounded. The succinct notation $\#CSP_d^c(\mathcal{F})$ used below specifies a problem of counting the number of Boolean assignments satisfying a given CSP, provided that (i) any unary unweighted Boolean constraint is allowed to use for free of charge and (ii) each variable appears at most d times among all given constraints, including free unary constraints.

Let $d \geq 3$ and let $\mathcal{F}$ be any set of unweighted Boolean constraints. If every constraint in $\mathcal{F}$ is affine, then $\#CSP_d^c(\mathcal{F})$ is in FP. Otherwise, if $\mathcal{F}$ is included in *IM-conj*, then $\#CSP_d^c(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{AP} \#BIS$. Otherwise, if $\mathcal{F} \subseteq OR\text{-conj}$ or $\mathcal{F} \subseteq NAND\text{-conj}$, then $\#w\text{-}HIS_d \leq_{AP} \#CSP_d^c(\mathcal{F}) \leq_{AP} \#w\text{-}HIS_{kd}$. Otherwise, $\#CSP_d^c(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{AP} \#SAT$, where w is the width of $\mathcal{F}$ and k is a certain constant depending only on $\mathcal{F}$.

Here, *IM-conj*, *OR-conj*, *NAND-conj* are three well-defined sets of unweighted Boolean constraints, $\#SAT$ is the counting satisfiability problem, $\#BIS$ is the bipartite independent set problem, and $\#w\text{-}HIS_d$ denotes the hypergraph independent set problem with hyperedge degree at most d and width at most w . The notations $\leq_{AP}$ and $\equiv_{AP}$ respectively refer to the AP-reducibility and AP-equivalence between two counting problems. As a special case, when $d \geq 25$ and $w \geq 2$, as shown in [8], there is no *fully polynomial-time randomized approximation scheme* (or FPRAS) for $\#w\text{-}HIS_d$ unless $NP = RP$. This classification theorem heavily relies on the aforementioned work of Dyer et al. [13].

Toward our main theorem, we first introduce a set $\mathcal{ED}$ of complex-weighted constraints constructed from unary constraints, the equality constraint, and the disequality constraint. Similar to the above case of Dyer et al., we also allow a free use of arbitrary (complex-weighted) unary constraints. For notational convenience, we use the notation $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$ to emphasize that all complex-weighted unary constraints are freely given. The main purpose of this paper is to prove the following dichotomy theorem that classifies all $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$ ’s into exactly two categories.

Theorem 1.1 *Let $d \geq 3$ be any degree bound. If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{ED}$, then $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$ belongs to $FP_{\mathbb{C}}$; otherwise, $\#SAT_{\mathbb{C}} \leq_{AP} \#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$ holds.*

Here, $\#SAT_{\mathbb{C}}$ is a complex-weighted version of the counting satisfiability problem and $FP_{\mathbb{C}}$ is the class of polynomial-time computable complex-valued functions (see Sections 2.4–2.5 and 3 for their precise definitions). In contrast to the result of Dyer et al. [13], Theorem 1.1 exhibits a stark difference between unweighted Boolean constraints and complex-weighted Boolean constraints, partly because of strong expressiveness of complex-weighted unary constraints even when the maximal degree of instances is upper-bounded.

Instead of relying on the result of Dyer et al., our proof is actually based on the following dichotomy theorem of Yamakami [21], who proved the theorem using a theory of *signature* [1, 2] developed from Valiant’s *holgraphic algorithms* [19, 20].

If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{ED}$, then $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ is in $FP_{\mathbb{C}}$. Otherwise, $\#SAT_{\mathbb{C}} \leq_{AP} \#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$.

To appeal to this result, we wish to claim the following key proposition, which bridges between unbounded-degree $\#CSP$ s and bounded-degree $\#CSP$ s.

Proposition 1.2 *For any degree bound d at least 3, $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{AP} \#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ holds for any set $\mathcal{F}$ of complex-weighted constraints.*

From this proposition, Theorem 1.1 immediately follows. The most part of this paper will be therefore devoted to proving this key proposition. When the degree bound d equals two, on the contrary, $\#\text{CSP}_2^*(\mathcal{F})$ is equivalent in approximation complexity to Holant problems restricted to the set $\mathcal{F}$ of constraints, provided that all unary constraints are freely available, where *Holant problems* were introduced by Cai et al. [3] to study a wider range of counting problems in a certain unified way. In the case of degree 1, however, every $\#\text{CSP}_1^*(\mathcal{F})$ is solvable in polynomial time.

Our argument for complex-weighted constraints is obviously different from Dyer et al.’s argument for unweighted constraints and also from Cai et al.’s argument for exact counting using complex-valued signatures. While a key technique in [11] is “3-simulatability” as well as “ppp-definability,” our proof argument exploits a notion of *limited T-constructibility*—a restricted version of T-constructibility developed in [21]. With its extensive use, the proof we will present in Section 8 becomes quite elementary and intuitive.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of all *natural numbers* (i.e., non-negative integers) and $\mathbb{N}^+$ means $\mathbb{N} - \{0\}$. Similarly, $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ denote respectively the sets of all *real numbers* and of all *complex numbers*. For succinctness, the notation $[n]$ for a number $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ expresses the integer set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. The notations $|\alpha|$ and $\arg(\alpha)$ for a complex number α denote the *absolute value* and the *argument* of α . We always assume that $\arg(\alpha) \in (-\pi, \pi]$. To improve readability, we often identify the “name” of a node in a given undirected graph with the “label” of the same node although there might be more than one node with the same label. For instance, we may call a specific node v whose label is x by “node x ” as far as the node in question is clear from the context.

Hereafter, we will give brief explanations to several important concepts and notations used in the rest of the paper.

2.1 Complex Numbers and Computability

Our core subject is the approximate computability of complex-weighted Boolean counting problems. Since such problems can be seen as complex-valued functions taking Boolean variables as input instances, we need to address a technical issue of how to handle arbitrary complex numbers and those complex-valued functions in an existing framework of string-based computation.

Our interest in this paper is not limited to so-called “polynomial-time computable” numbers, such as algebraic numbers, numbers expressed exactly by polynomially many bits, or numbers defined by efficiently generated Cauchy series [15]. Because there is no consensus of how to define “polynomial-time computability” of complex numbers, as done in the recent literature [1, 2, 3, 21], we wish to make our arguments in this paper independent of the definition of “polynomial-time computable” numbers. To fulfill this ambitious purpose, although slightly unconventional, we rather treat the complex numbers as basic “objects” and perform natural “operations” (such as, multiplications, addition, division, subtraction, etc.) as well as simple “comparisons” (such as, equality checking, less-than-or-equal checking, etc.) as basic manipulations of those numbers. Each of such manipulations of one or more complex numbers is assumed to consume only *constant time*. We want to make this assumption on the constant execution time cause no harm in a later discussion on the computability of complex-valued functions. It is thus imperative to regulate all manipulations to perform only in a clearly described algorithmic way. This strict regulation guarantees that our arguments properly work in the scope of many choices of “polynomial-time computable” complex numbers.

From a practical viewpoint, the reader may ask how we will “describe” arbitrary complex-valued function or, when an input instance contains complex numbers, how we will “describe” those numbers as a part of the input given to an algorithm in question. Notice that, by running a randomized algorithm within a polynomial amount of execution time, we need to distinguish only exponentially many complex numbers. Hence, those numbers may be specified by appropriately designated “indices,” which may be expressed in polynomially many bits. In this way, all input complex numbers, for instance, can be properly indexed when they are given as a part of each input instance, and those numbers are referred to by those indices during an execution of the algorithm. The reader is referred to, e.g., [22, Section 4] for a string-based treatment of arbitrary complex numbers. Indexing complex numbers also helps us view a complex-valued function as a “map” from Boolean variables to fixed indices of complex numbers.

In the rest of this paper, we assume a suitable method of indexing arbitrary complex numbers.

2.2 Constraints and #CSPs

Given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ (where V is a *node set* and E is an *edge set*) and a node $v \in V$, an *incident set* $E(v)$ of v is the set of all edges *incident* on v (i.e., $E(v) = \{w \in V | (v, w) \in E\}$), and $\deg(v)$ is the *degree* of v (i.e., $\deg(v) = |E(v)|$). A *bipartite graph* is described as a triplet of the form $(V_1 | V_2, E)$, of which V_1 and V_2 respectively denote sets of nodes on the left-hand side and on the right-hand side of the graph and E denotes a set of edges (i.e., $E \subseteq V_1 \times V_2$).

Each function f from $\{0, 1\}^k$ to $\mathbb{C}$ is called a *k-ary constraint* (or *signature*, in case of Holant problems), where k is called the *arity* of f . Assuming the standard lexicographic order on $\{0, 1\}^k$, we often express f as a series of its output values, and thus it can be identified with an element in the space $\mathbb{C}^{2^k}$. For instance, when $k = 1$ and $k = 2$, f can be written respectively as $(f(0), f(1))$ and $(f(00), f(01), f(10), f(11))$. A constraint f is *symmetric* if f 's values depend only on the *Hamming weight* of inputs. When f is a symmetric function of arity k , we also use a succinct notation $f = [f_0, f_1, \dots, f_k]$, where each f_i is the value of f on any input of Hamming weight i . As a simple example, the equality function EQ_k of arity k is expressed as $[1, 0, \dots, 0, 1]$ ($k - 1$ zeros). In particular, EQ_1 equals $[1, 1]$. For convenience, let $\Delta_0 = [1, 0]$ and $\Delta_1 = [0, 1]$. For a later use, we reserve the notation $\mathcal{U}$ for the set of all unary (i.e., arity-1) constraints.

We quickly review a set of useful notations used in [21]. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let $i, j \in [k]$, let $c \in \{0, 1\}$, and let f be any arity- k constraint. Moreover, let $x_1, \dots, x_k$ be k Boolean variables. *Pinning* is a method of constructing a new constraint $f^{x_i=c}$ from f , where $f^{x_i=c}$ is the constraint defined by $f^{x_i=c}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k) = f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, c, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k)$. In contrast, *projection* is a way of building a new constraint $f^{x_i=*}$ that is defined as $f^{x_i=*}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{x_i \in \{0, 1\}} f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k)$. When $i \neq j$, the notation $f^{x_j=x_i}$ denotes the constraint defined as $f^{x_j=x_i}(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_k) = f(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_i, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_k)$. To *normalize* f means that we choose an appropriate constant $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} - \{0\}$ and then construct a new constraint $\lambda \cdot f$ from f , where $\lambda \cdot f$ denotes the constraint g defined as $g(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \lambda \cdot f(x_1, \dots, x_k)$. When g_1 and g_2 share the same input-variable sequence, $g_1 \cdot g_2$ denotes the constraint h defined as $h(x_1, \dots, x_k) = g_1(x_1, \dots, x_k)g_2(x_1, \dots, x_k)$. By extending these notations naturally, we abbreviate, e.g., $(f^{x_1=0})_{x_2=1}$ as $f^{x_1=0, x_2=1}$ and $(f^{x_1=*})_{x_2=*}$ as $f^{x_1=*, x_2=*}$.

For each set $\mathcal{F}$ of constraints, a *complex-weighted Boolean #CSP*, succinctly denoted $\#CSP(\mathcal{F})$, is a counting problem whose input instance is a finite set Ω of “elements” of the form $\langle h, (x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_k}) \rangle$, where $h : \{0, 1\}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is in $\mathcal{F}$ and $x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_k}$ are some of n Boolean variables $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ (i.e., $i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n]$), and $\#CSP(\mathcal{F})$ asks to compute the value $\text{csp}_\Omega = \sum_\sigma \prod_{\langle h, x \rangle \in \Omega} h(\sigma(x_{i_1}), \sigma(x_{i_2}), \dots, \sigma(x_{i_k}))$, where $x = (x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_k})$ and $\sigma : \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ ranges over the set of all *variable assignments*. To improve readability, we often omit the set notation and express, e.g., $\#CSP(f, g, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ to mean $\#CSP(\{f, g\} \cup \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{G})$. Since we always admit arbitrary unary constraints for free of charge, we briefly write $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ instead of $\#CSP(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$.

From a different viewpoint, an input instance Ω to $\#CSP(\mathcal{F})$ can be stated as a triplet $(G, X | \mathcal{F}', \pi)$, which consists of a finite undirected bipartite graph $G = (V_1 | V_2, E)$, a variable set $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, a *finite* subset $\mathcal{F}'$ of $\mathcal{F}$, and a labeling function $\pi : V_1 \cup V_2 \rightarrow X \cup \mathcal{F}'$, where $\pi(V_1) = X$ and $\pi(V_2) \subseteq \mathcal{F}'$. In this graph representation, the label of each node v in V_1 is distinct variable x_i in X , each node w in V_2 has constraint h in $\mathcal{F}'$ as its label, and an edge e in E incident on both nodes v and w indicates that the constraint h takes the variable x_i (as part of its input variables). Such labeling of constraints is formally given by the labeling function π . For simplicity, $\pi(v)$ is written as f_v . To emphasize this graph representation, we intend to call $\Omega = (G, X | \mathcal{F}', \pi)$ a *constraint frame* for $\#CSP(\mathcal{F})$ [21]. The use of the notion of constraint frame makes it possible to discuss a counting problem $\#CSP(\mathcal{F})$ in a general framework of Holant problem (on a Boolean domain) [3], which will be given in the next subsection.

For each input instance $\Omega = (G, X | \mathcal{F}', \pi)$ given to $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$, the *degree* of the instance Ω is the greatest number of times that any variable appears among its constraints in $\mathcal{F}'$; in other words, the maximum degree of any node that appears on the left-hand side of the bipartite graph G . For any positive integer d , we write $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$ for the restriction of $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ to instances of degree at most d .

2.3 Holant Problems

In a Holant framework, “(complex-weighted) constraints” are always referred to as “signatures.” For our convenience, we often use these two words interchangeably. Now, we will follow the terminology developed in [1, 2]. A *Holant problem* $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F})$ (on a Boolean domain) takes an input instance, called a *signature grid* $\Omega = (G, \mathcal{F}', \pi)$, composed of a finite undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, a finite set $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, and a labeling function $\pi : V \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'$, where each node $v \in V$ is labeled by a signature $\pi(v) : \{0, 1\}^{\deg(v)} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. We often use the notation f_v for $\pi(v)$. Instead of variable assignments used for $\#CSP(\mathcal{F})$'s, here we use

“edge assignments.” We denote by $Asn(E)$ the set of all edge assignments $\sigma : E \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. The Holant problem asks to compute the value $\text{Holant}_\Omega = \sum_{\sigma \in Asn(E)} \prod_{v \in V} f_v(\sigma|E(v))$, where $\sigma|E(v)$ denotes the sequence $(\sigma(w_1), \sigma(w_2), \dots, \sigma(w_k))$ of bits if $E(v) = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k\}$, sorted in a certain pre-determined order (depending only on f_v). A *bipartite Holant problem* $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F}_1|\mathcal{F}_2)$ is a variant of Holant problem, defined as follows. An input instance is a *bipartite signature grid* $\Omega = (G, \mathcal{F}'_1|\mathcal{F}'_2, \pi)$ consisting of a finite undirected bipartite graph $G = (V_1|V_2, E)$, two finite sets $\mathcal{F}'_1 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}'_2 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_2$, and a labeling function $\pi : V_1 \cup V_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'_1 \cup \mathcal{F}'_2$ satisfying that $\pi(V_1) \subseteq \mathcal{F}'_1$ and $\pi(V_2) \subseteq \mathcal{F}'_2$.

Exploiting a direct connection between $\#CSP$ s and Holant problems, it is useful to view $\#CSP(\mathcal{F})$ as a special case of bipartite Holant problem by the following translation: a constraint frame $\Omega = (G, X|\mathcal{F}', \pi)$ for $\#CSP(\mathcal{F})$ with $G = (V_1|V_2, E)$ is modified into a signature grid $\Omega' = (G', \{EQ_k\}_{k \geq 1}|\mathcal{F}', \pi')$ that is obtained as follows. The graph G' is obtained from G by replacing the variable label of any degree- k node v in V_1 by the arity- k equality function EQ_k . It is not difficult to see that any edge assignment that assigns 0 (1, resp.) to all edges incident on this node v uniquely substitutes a variable assignment giving 0 (1, resp.) to the node v for $\#CSP(\mathcal{F})$. The labeling function π' is defined accordingly. In terms of Holant problems, $\#CSP(\mathcal{F})$ is just another name for $\text{Holant}(\{EQ_k\}_{k \geq 1}|\mathcal{F})$. Similarly, $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ coincides with $\text{Holant}(\{EQ_k\}_{k \geq 1}|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$. Moreover, for each degree bound $d \geq 1$, $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$ is identified with $\text{Holant}(\{EQ_k\}_{k \in [d]}|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$.

2.4 $\text{FP}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and AP-Reductions

Following the way we handle complex numbers (see Section 2.1), a complex analogue of FP , denoted $\text{FP}_{\mathbb{C}}$, is naturally defined as the set of all functions, mapping strings to $\mathbb{C}$, which can be computed deterministically in time polynomial in the lengths of input strings, where “strings” are finite sequences of symbols chosen from (nonempty finite) alphabets. Let Σ be any alphabet and let F be any function mapping from Σ^* (i.e., the set of all strings over Σ) to $\mathbb{C}$. A *randomized approximation scheme* (or RAS) for F is a randomized algorithm (equipped with a coin-flipping mechanism) that takes a standard input $x \in \Sigma^*$ together with an *error tolerance parameter* $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and outputs values w in $\mathbb{C}$ with probability at least $3/4$ for which $2^{-\varepsilon} \leq |w/F(x)| \leq 2^\varepsilon$ and $|\arg(w/F(x))| \leq \varepsilon$, provided that, whenever $F(x) = 0$, we always demand $w = 0$. See [21, Lemma 9.2] for usefulness of this definition.

Given two functions F and G , a *polynomial-time approximation-preserving reduction* (or *AP-reduction*) from F to G is a randomized algorithm M that takes a pair $(x, \varepsilon) \in \Sigma^* \times (0, 1)$ as input instance, uses an arbitrary RAS N for G as *oracle*, and satisfies the following conditions: (i) M is still a valid RAS for F ; (ii) every oracle call made by M is of the form $(w, \delta) \in \Sigma^* \times (0, 1)$ with $\delta^{-1} \leq \text{poly}(|x|, 1/\varepsilon)$ and its answer is the outcome of N on (w, δ) , provided that any complex number included in this string w should be completely “specified” (see Section 2.1) by M ; and (iii) the running time of M is bounded from above by a certain polynomial in $(|x|, 1/\varepsilon)$, not depending on the choice of N . In this case, we write $F \leq_{\text{AP}} G$ and we also say that F is *AP-reducible* to G (or F is *AP-reduced* to G). If both $F \leq_{\text{AP}} G$ and $G \leq_{\text{AP}} F$ hold, then F and G are said to be *AP-equivalent* and we write $F \equiv_{\text{AP}} G$.

The following lemma, whose proof is straightforward and left to the reader, is useful in later sections.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}$ be any three constraint sets and let $e, d \in \mathbb{N}^+$.*

1. *If $d \leq e$, then $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#CSP_e^*(\mathcal{F})$.*
2. *If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, then $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{G})$.*
3. *If $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{G})$ and $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{G}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{H})$, then $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{H})$.*

2.5 Counting Problem $\#SAT_{\mathbb{C}}$

We briefly describe the counting problem $\#SAT_{\mathbb{C}}$, introduced in [21], which has appeared in Section 1. For the proof of our main theorem, since our proof heavily relies on [21], there is in fact no need of knowing any structural property of this counting problem; however, the interested reader is referred to [21] for its properties and connections to other counting problems.

A complex-weighted version of the counting satisfiability problem ($\#SAT$), denoted $\#SAT_{\mathbb{C}}$, is induced naturally from $\#SAT$ as follows. Let ϕ be any propositional formula and let $V(\phi)$ denote the set of all Boolean variables appearing in ϕ . In addition, let $\{w_x\}_{x \in V(\phi)}$ be any series of *node-weight functions* $w_x : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} - \{0\}$ for each variable x in $V(\phi)$. Given the input pair $(\phi, \{w_x\}_{x \in V(\phi)})$, $\#SAT_{\mathbb{C}}$ outputs the sum of all weights $w(\sigma)$ for truth assignments σ satisfying ϕ , where $w(\sigma)$ denotes the product of all values $w_x(\sigma(x))$ over all variables $x \in V(\phi)$. Since $\#SAT$ is a special case of $\#SAT_{\mathbb{C}}$, it naturally holds that $\#SAT \leq_{\text{AP}} \#SAT_{\mathbb{C}}$.

3 Special Constraint Sets

We treat a *relation* of arity k as both a subset of $\{0,1\}^k$ and a function mapping k Boolean variables to $\{0,1\}$. From this duality, we often utilize the following “functional” notation: for every $x \in \{0,1\}^k$, $R(x) = 1$ ($R(x) = 0$, resp.) iff $x \in R$ ($x \notin R$, resp.). The *underlying relation* R_f of a constraint f of arity k is the set $\{x \in \{0,1\}^k \mid f(x) \neq 0\}$. A constraint f is called *non-zero* if $f(x) \neq 0$ for all inputs $x \in \{0,1\}^k$. Note that, for any constraint f , there exists a *non-zero* constraint g for which $f = R_f \cdot g$, where R_f is viewed as a Boolean function. This fundamental property will be frequently used in the subsequent sections.

In this paper, we use the following special relations: $XOR = [0, 1, 0]$, $Implies = (1, 1, 0, 1)$, $OR_k = [0, 1, \dots, 1]$ (k ones), $NAND_k = [1, \dots, 1, 0]$ (k ones), and $EQ_k = [1, 0, \dots, 0, 1]$ ($k-1$ zeros), where $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$. Slightly abusing notations, we let the notation EQ (OR and $NAND$, resp.) refer to the equality function (OR -function and $NAND$ -function, resp.) of *arbitrary arity larger than one*. This notational convention is quite useful when we do not want to specify its arity.

Moreover, we use the following two sets of relations. A relation R is in $DISJ$ ($NAND$, resp.) if it equals a product of a *positive* number of relations of the forms OR_k ($NAND_k$, resp.), Δ_0 , and Δ_1 , where $k \geq 2$ (slightly different from OR -conj and $NAND$ -conj in [11]). Notice that the empty relation “ $\emptyset$ ” is in $DISJ \cup NAND$. Next, we introduce six sets of constraints, the first four of which were defined in [21].

1. Recall that $\mathcal{U}$ denotes the set of all unary constraints.
2. Let $\mathcal{NZ}$ denote the set of arbitrary non-zero constraints.
3. Let $\mathcal{DG}$ denote the set of all constraints f that are expressed as products of unary constraints, each of which is applied to a different variable of f . Every constraint in $\mathcal{DG}$ is called *degenerate*. In particular, $\mathcal{U}$ is included in $\mathcal{DG}$. The underlying relation of any degenerate constraint is also degenerate; however, the converse is not true in general.
4. Let $\mathcal{ED}$ denote the set of constraints expressed as products of unary constraints, the binary equality EQ_2 , and the binary disequality XOR . Clearly, $\mathcal{DG} \subseteq \mathcal{ED}$ holds. The name “ $\mathcal{ED}$ ” refers to its key components of “equality” and “disequality.”
5. Let $\mathcal{DISJ}$ be the set of all constraints f for which R_f is in $DISJ$.
6. Let $\mathcal{NAND}$ be the set of all constraints f for which R_f belongs to $NAND$.

For later convenience, we list a simple characterization of binary constraints in $\mathcal{DG}$.

Lemma 3.1 *Let f be any binary constraint $f = (a, b, c, d)$ with $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{C}$. It holds that $f \notin \mathcal{DG}$ iff $ad \neq bc$.*

Proof. Let $f = (a, b, c, d)$ with $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{C}$. First, assume that f is degenerate. Since $f \in \mathcal{DG}$, there are four constants $x, y, z, w \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $f(x_1, x_2) = [x, y](x_1) \cdot [z, w](x_2)$ holds for every vector $(x_1, x_2) \in \{0,1\}^2$. This implies $f = (xz, xw, yz, yw)$. Since f equals (a, b, c, d) , we obtain $ad = xyzw = bc$, as required. Next, we assume that $ad = bc$. There are three cases to examine separately.

(i) Consider the case where $a = 0$. By our assumption, either $b = 0$ or $c = 0$ holds. If $b = 0$, then it holds that $f(x_1, x_2) = [0, 1](x_1) \cdot [c, d](x_2)$; thus, f is degenerate. Similarly, when $c = 0$, we obtain $f(x_1, x_2) = [b, d](x_1) \cdot [0, 1](x_2)$ and thus f is degenerate.

(ii) The case where $d = 0$ is similar to Case (i).

(iii) Finally, assume that $ad \neq 0$. Obviously, $bc \neq 0$ holds since $ad = bc$. Let us define $y = \frac{b}{a} = \frac{d}{c}$. Since $b = ay$ and $d = cy$, it instantly follows that $f(x_1, x_2) = [a, c](x_1) \cdot [1, y](x_2)$. From this equality, we conclude that f is degenerate. $\square$

A key idea of [21] is a certain form of “factorization” of a target constraint. For each constraint f in $\mathcal{ED}$, for instance, its underlying relation R_f can be expressed by a product $R_f = g_1 \cdot g_2 \cdots g_m$, where each constraint g_i is one of the following forms: $u(x)$, $EQ_2(x, y)$, and $XOR(x, y)$ (where x and y may be the same), where u is an arbitrary unary constraint. This indicates that f is “factorized” into *factors*: $g_1, \dots, g_m$ (which always include the information on input variables). The list $L = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m\}$ of all such factors is succinctly called a *factor list* for R_f .

In our later argument, factor lists will play an essential role. Let us introduce a notion—an *or-distinctive* list—for each constraint in $\mathcal{DISJ}$. Associated with a constraint f in $\mathcal{DISJ}$, let us consider a list L of all factors of the form $\Delta_0(x)$, $\Delta_1(x)$, and $OR_d(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k})$, that characterizes R_f . This factor list L is called *or-distinctive* if (i) no variable appears more than once in each OR in L , (ii) no two factors Δ_c ($c \in \{0,1\}$) and OR in L share the same variable, (iii) no OR ’s variables form a subset of any other’s (when ignoring the variable order), and (iv) every OR in L has at least two variables. For each constraint in $\mathcal{NAND}$, we obtain a similar notion of *nand-distinctive list* by replacing OR s with $NAND$ s.

The following lemma is fundamentally the same as [11, Lemma 3.2] for Boolean constraints.

Lemma 3.2 *For any constraint f in $\mathcal{DISJ}$, there exists a unique or-distinctive list of all factors of R_f . The same holds for $\mathcal{nand}$ -distinctive lists and $\mathcal{NAND}$.*

Proof. Let f be any k -ary constraint in $\mathcal{DISJ}$ and let L be any factor list for R_f with the condition that each factor in L has one of the following forms: $\Delta_0(x)$, $\Delta_1(x)$, and $OR_d(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_d})$, where $d \geq 2$ and $i_1, \dots, i_d \in [k]$. Now, let us consider the following procedure that transforms L into another factor list, which becomes or-distinctive. For ease of the description of this procedure, we assume that, during the procedure, whenever all variables are completely deleted from an argument place of any factor g in L , this g is automatically removed from the list L , since g is no longer a valid constraint. Moreover, if there are two exactly the same factors (with the same series of input variables), then exactly one of them is automatically deleted from L . Finally, since OR_1 equals Δ_1 , any factor $OR_1(x)$ in L is automatically replaced by $\Delta_1(x)$.

(i) For each factor OR_d in L , if a variable x appears more than once in its argument place, then we delete the second occurrence of x from the argument place. This deletion causes this OR_d to shrink to an OR_{d-1} . Now, we assume that every factor OR in L has no duplicated variables. (ii) If two factors OR_d and Δ_1 in L share the same variable, say, x , then we remove this OR_d from L . This removal is legitimate because this OR_d is clearly redundant. (iii) If two factors OR_d and Δ_0 in L share the same variable x , then we delete x from any argument places of *all* OR s in L . This process is also legitimate, because x is pinned down to 0 by $\Delta_0(x)$ and it does not contribute to the outcome of OR s. It is not difficult to show that the list obtained from L by executing this procedure is indeed or-distinctive.

To complete the proof, we will show the uniqueness of any or-distinctive list for R_f . Assume that L_1 and L_2 are two distinct or-distinctive lists of all factors of R_f . Henceforth, we intend to show that $L_1 \subseteq L_2$. For simplicity, let $X_0 = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ denote the set of all variables that do not appear in any factor of the form Δ_c ($c \in \{0, 1\}$) in L_1 . We note that any factor Δ_c in L_2 takes no variable in X_0 because, otherwise, L_1 and L_2 must define two different relations, a contradiction against our assumption that L_1 and L_2 are factor lists for the same relation R_f . Toward our goal, we need to prove two claims.

First, we claim that all factors of the form Δ_c ($c \in \{0, 1\}$) in L_1 belong to L_2 . Assume otherwise; that is, there is a factor $\Delta_c(x)$ that appears in L_1 but not in L_2 . Notice that x should appear in a certain factor in L_2 . If the factor $\Delta_{1-c}(x)$ is present in L_2 , then L_1 and L_2 should define two different relations, a clear contradiction. Hence, L_2 does not contain $\Delta_{1-c}(x)$. Since x cannot appear in both Δ_0 and Δ_1 in L_2 , x must appear in a certain OR , say, h of arity m in L_2 . Since L_2 is an or-distinctive list, $m \geq 2$ follows. Let us choose a variable assignment a to x satisfying $\Delta_c(a) = 0$. By choosing another assignment $b \in \{0, 1\}^{m-1}$ appropriately, we can force $h(a, b) = 1$. This is a clear contradiction.

Next, we claim that all OR s in L_1 are also in L_2 . Toward a contradiction, we assume that (after appropriately permuting variable indices) $g(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ is an OR_d in L_1 but not in L_2 . Let $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_d\}$. By the or-distinctiveness, any other OR in L_1 should contain at least one variable in $X_0 - X$. We need to examine the following two cases separately. (1)' Assume that there exist an index $m \in [d-1]$ and a factor h of the form OR_m (or Δ_1 if $m = 1$) in L_2 satisfying that all variables of h are in X . Since $m < d$, we obtain both $h(0^m) = 0$ and $g(0^m, 1^{d-m}) = 1$. This is a contradiction. (2)' Assume that every factor h of the form OR in L_2 contains at least one variable in $X_0 - X$. Clearly, it holds that $g(0^d) = 0$ and $h(a, b) = 1$, where a and b are respectively appropriate nonempty portions of 0^d and 1^{k-d} . This also leads to a contradiction. Therefore, g should belong to L_2 .

In the end, we conclude that $L_1 \subseteq L_2$. Since we can prove by symmetry that $L_2 \subseteq L_1$, this yields the equality $L_1 = L_2$, and thus we establish the uniqueness of an or-distinctive list for R_f . The case for $\mathcal{NAND}$ can be similarly treated. $\square$

4 Limited T-Constructibility

A technical tool used for an analysis of $\#CSP$ s in [21] is the notion of *T-constructibility*, which asserts that a given constraint can be systematically “constructed” by applying certain specific operations recursively, starting from a finite set of target constraints. Such a construction directly corresponds to a modification of bipartite graphs in constraint frames. Since our target is bounded-degree $\#CSP$ s, we rather use its weakened version.

Now, we introduce our key notion of *limited T-constructibility*, which will play a central role in our later arguments toward the proof of the main theorem. Let f be any constraint of arity $k \geq 1$ and let $\mathcal{G}$ be any *finite* constraint set. We say that an undirected bipartite graph $G = (V_1|V_2, E)$ (implicitly with

a labeling function π) represents f if V_1 consists only of k nodes labeled $x_1, \dots, x_k$, which may have a certain number of dangling[§] edges, and V_2 contains only a node labeled f , to whom every node x_i is adjacent. As noted before, we write f_w for $\pi(w)$. We also say that G realizes f by $\mathcal{G}$ if the following four conditions are met: (i) $\pi(V_2) \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, (ii) G contains at least k nodes labeled $x_1, \dots, x_k$, possibly together with nodes associated with other variables, say, $y_1, \dots, y_m$; namely, $V_1 = \{x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_m\}$ (by identifying a node name with its variable label), (iii) only the nodes $x_1, \dots, x_k$ may have dangling edges, and (iv) $f(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \lambda \sum_{y_1, \dots, y_m \in \{0,1\}} \prod_{w \in V_2} f_w(z_1, \dots, z_d)$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} - \{0\}$ and $\{z_1, \dots, z_d\}$ is a subset of V_1 .

Example 4.1 Here, we give a useful example of an undirected bipartite graph that realizes a constraint g of particular form: (*) $g(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}} f(x_1, y)u(y)f(y, x_2)$. Corresponding to this equation (*), we construct the following graph, denoted $G^{[f,u]}$. This graph is composed of three nodes labeled x_1, x_2, y on its left-hand side and two nodes v_1 and v_2 labeled f as well as a node w labeled u on the right-hand side. The graph has an edge set $\{(x_1, v_1), (y, v_1), (y, w), (x_2, v_2), (y, v_2)\}$. Since this graph $G^{[f,u]}$ faithfully reflects the above equation (*), it is not difficult to check that Condition (iv) of the definition of realizability is satisfied. Therefore, $G^{[f,u]}$ realizes g by $\{f, u\}$.

Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ be any index. We write $f \leq_{con}^{+d} \mathcal{G}$ if the following conditions hold: for any number $m \geq 2$ and for any graph G representing f with distinct variables $x_1, \dots, x_k$ whose node degrees are at most m , there exists another graph G' such that (i) G' realizes f by $\mathcal{G}$, (ii) G' has the same dangling edges as G does, (iii) the nodes labeled $x_1, \dots, x_k$ have degree at most $m + d$, and (iv) all the other nodes on the left-hand side of G' have degree at most $\max\{3, d\}$. In this case, we loosely say that f is *limited T-constructible* from $\mathcal{G}$. The constraint g in Example 4.1 is limited T-constructible from $\{f, u\}$. More precisely, since $G^{[f,u]}$ contains the node y of degree 3, $g \leq_{con}^{+0} \{f, u\}$ holds. Although the above definition is general enough, in this paper, we are interested only in the case where $0 \leq d \leq 1$.

We will see another example.

Example 4.2 Let f and g be any two constraints. If f is obtained from g by pinning g , then $f \leq_{con}^{+0} \{g, \Delta_0, \Delta_1\}$ holds. To prove this statement, we here consider only a simple case where f is obtained from g by the equation $f(x_3, \dots, x_k) = g^{x_1=c_1, x_2=c_2}(x_3, \dots, x_k)$, where $k \geq 3$ and $c_1, c_2 \in \{0, 1\}$. A more general case can be treated similarly. Let G be any undirected bipartite graph that represents f with nodes having labels $x_3, \dots, x_k$. We construct another bipartite graph G' as follows. We prepare two “new” nodes whose labels are x_1 and x_2 . Remember that these variables do not appear in the argument place of f . Add these new nodes into G , replace the node f in G by a “new” node labeled g together with two extra edges incident on the nodes x_1 and x_2 , and finally attach two “new” nodes with labels Δ_{c_1} and Δ_{c_2} to the nodes x_1 and x_2 , respectively, by two “new” edges. Clearly, G' realizes f by $\{g, \Delta_{c_1}, \Delta_{c_2}\}$. Now, let us analyze the node degrees. Each node x_i ($3 \leq i \leq k$) in G' has the same degree as the original node x_i in G does. In contrast, the nodes x_1 and x_2 have only two incident edges. Therefore, we conclude that $f \leq_{con}^{+0} \{g, \Delta_{c_1}, \Delta_{c_2}\}$.

Unlike the case of T-constructibility, the property of *transitivity* does not hold for limited T-constructibility. Nonetheless, the following restricted form of transitivity is sufficient for our later arguments.

Lemma 4.3 Let f and g be any two constraints and let $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{G}_2$ be any two finite constraint sets. Moreover, let d be any number in $\mathbb{N}$. If $f \leq_{con}^{+d} \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \{g\}$ and $g \leq_{con}^{+0} \mathcal{G}_2$, then $f \leq_{con}^{+d} \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2$.

Proof. If g is already in $\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2$, then the lemma is trivially true; henceforth, we assume that $g \notin \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2$. Now, let $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k)$ be any constraint of arity $k \geq 1$ and let G_f be any undirected bipartite graph, comprised of k nodes labeled $x_1, \dots, x_k$ and a node labeled f , that represents f . Assume that $m \geq 2$ and each node x_i ($i \in [k]$) on the left-hand side of G_f has degree at most m . Since $f \leq_{con}^{+d} \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \{g\}$, there exists another undirected bipartite graph $G'_f = (V_1 | V_2, E)$ that realizes f by $\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \{g\}$. For simplicity, let $V_1 = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m\}$ with m variables $y_1, \dots, y_m$ not appearing in G_f . Note that, by the degree requirement of limited T-constructibility, every node x_i ($i \in [k]$) has degree at most $m + d$ and every node y_j ($j \in [m]$) has degree at most $\max\{3, d\}$.

Since there may be one or more nodes in G'_f whose labels are g , we want to eliminate recursively those nodes one by one. Choose any such node, say, w . We first remove from G'_f all nodes in $V_1 \cup V_2$ that are not adjacent to w and also remove their incident edges; however, we keep, as dangling edges, all edges between the remaining nodes in V_1 and the nodes other than w in V_2 . Let $\tilde{G} = (V'_1 | V'_2, E')$ be the resulting graph from G'_f . Since V'_1 is the set of remaining nodes in V_1 , without loss of generality, we assume that

[§]A *dangling edge* is obtained from an edge by deleting exactly one end of the edge. These dangling edges are treated as “normal” edges. Therefore, the degree of a node should count dangling edges as well.

$V_1' = \{x_1, \dots, x_a, y_1, \dots, y_b\}$, where $0 \leq a \leq k$ and $0 \leq b \leq m$. Since g takes all those variables, $\tilde{G}$ obviously represents g . In this graph $\tilde{G}$, since $f \leq_{\text{con}}^{+d} \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \{g\}$, every node x_i must have degree at most $m + d$ while each node y_j has degree at most $\max\{3, d\}$. Since $g \leq_{\text{con}}^{+0} \mathcal{G}_2$, there is another bipartite graph $\tilde{G}' = (V_1'' | V_2'', E'')$ that realizes g by $\mathcal{G}_2$. Now, assume that $V_1'' = \{x_1, \dots, x_a, y_1, \dots, y_b, z_1, \dots, z_c\}$ with “fresh” variables $z_1, \dots, z_c$. Note that the degrees of the nodes x_i and y_j in $\tilde{G}'$ are the same as that in $\tilde{G}$, and the degree of any other node z_i in V_1'' is at most three. Inside $\tilde{G}_f$, we then replace the subgraph $\tilde{G}$ by $\tilde{G}'$. Clearly, the resulting graph has fewer nodes with the label g than $\tilde{G}_f$ does. We continue this elimination process until the nodes labeled g are all removed.

In the end, let G_* be the obtained bipartite graph. On the right-hand side of G_* , there are only nodes whose labels are taken from $\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2$. By its definition, G_* realizes f by $\mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2$. Moreover, in this graph G_* , the degree of every node x_i is still at most $m + d$ whereas any other node has degree at most $\max\{3, d\}$. Therefore, we conclude that $f \leq_{\text{con}}^{+d} \mathcal{G}_1 \cup \mathcal{G}_2$, as requested. $\square$

5 Constructing AP-Reductions to the Equality

Dyer et al. [11] analyzed the complexity of approximately solving unweighted bounded-degree Boolean #CSPs and proved the first approximation-complexity classification theorem for those #CSPs using notions of “3-simulatability” and “ppp-definability.” In their classification theorem, stated in Section 1, they recognized four fundamental categories of counting problems. We intend to extend their theorem from unweighted #CSPs to complex-weighted #CSPs by employing the notion of limited T-constructibility described in Section 4. Our goal is therefore to prove our main theorem, Theorem 1.1.

We start with a brief discussion on the polynomial-time computability of bounded-degree Boolean #CSPs. For any constraint set $\mathcal{F}$, it is already known from [21] that, when $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{ED}$, $\#\text{CSP}^*(\mathcal{F})$ is solvable in polynomial time and thus belongs to $\text{FP}_{\mathbb{C}}$. From this computability result, since $\#\text{CSP}_d^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#\text{CSP}^*(\mathcal{F})$, the following statement is immediate.

Lemma 5.1 *For any constraint set $\mathcal{F}$ and any index $d \geq 2$, if $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{ED}$, then $\#\text{CSP}_d^*(\mathcal{F})$ belongs to $\text{FP}_{\mathbb{C}}$.*

The remaining case where $\mathcal{F} \not\subseteq \mathcal{ED}$ is the most challenging one in this paper. In what follows, we are focused on this difficult case. At this point, we are ready to describe an outline of our proof of the main theorem. For notational convenience, we write $\mathcal{EQ}$ for the set $\{EQ_k\}_{k \geq 2}$, where we do not include the equality of arity 1, because it is in $\mathcal{U}$ and is always available for free of charge. Cai et al. [3] first laid out a basic scheme of how to prove a classification theorem for complex-weighted degree-3 Boolean #CSPs. Later, this scheme was modified by Dyer et al. [11] to prove their classification theorem for unweighted degree- d Boolean #CSPs for any $d \geq 3$. Our proof strategy closely follows theirs even though we deal with *weighted* degree- d #CSPs.

For a technical reason, it is better for us to introduce a notation $\#\text{CSP}_d^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F})$, which is induced from $\#\text{CSP}_d^*(\mathcal{EQ}, \mathcal{F})$, by imposing the following extra condition (assuming $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{EQ} = \emptyset$):

(*) In each constraint frame $\Omega = (G, X | \mathcal{F}', \pi)$ given as input instance, no two nodes labeled EQ s in $\mathcal{EQ}$ (possibly having different arities) on the right-hand side of the undirected bipartite graph G are adjacent to the same node having a variable label on the left-hand side of the graph.

In other words, any two nodes with labels from $\mathcal{EQ}$ on the right-hand side of G are not linked directly by any single node. This artificial condition (*) is necessary in the proof of Lemma 5.3. Similarly, we define $\#\text{CSP}_d^*(EQ_k \parallel \mathcal{F})$ using the singleton $\{EQ_k\}$ instead of $\mathcal{EQ}$. Our proof strategy comprises the following four steps.

1. First, for any constraint set $\mathcal{F}$, we will claim that $\#\text{CSP}^*(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \#\text{CSP}^*(\mathcal{F}')$, where $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{EQ}$. Meanwhile, we will focus on this set $\mathcal{F}'$. Second, we will add the equality of various arity and then reduce the original #CSPs to bounded-degree #CSPs with the above-mentioned condition (*). More precisely, we will AP-reduce $\#\text{CSP}^*(\mathcal{F}')$ to $\#\text{CSP}_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}')$.
2. For any index $d \geq 2$ and for any constraint $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we will AP-reduce $\#\text{CSP}_2^*(EQ_d \parallel \mathcal{F}')$ to $\#\text{CSP}_3^*(f, \mathcal{F}')$, which is clearly AP-reducible to $\#\text{CSP}_3^*(\mathcal{F})$ since $\{f\} \cup \mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. In addition, we will demand that this reduction should be algorithmically “generic” and “efficient” so that if we can AP-reduce $\#\text{CSP}_2^*(EQ_d \parallel \mathcal{F}')$ to $\#\text{CSP}_3^*(f, \mathcal{F}')$ for every index $d \geq 3$, then we immediately obtain $\#\text{CSP}_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}') \leq_{\text{AP}} \#\text{CSP}_3^*(\mathcal{F})$.

3. Combining the above two AP-reductions, we obtain the AP-reduction $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq_{AP} \#CSP_3^*(\mathcal{F})$ by Lemma 2.1. Since $\#CSP_3^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq_{AP} \#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq_{AP} \#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ for any index $d \geq 3$, we conclude that $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{AP} \#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$. This becomes our key claim, Proposition 1.2.
4. Finally, we will apply the dichotomy theorem [21] for $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$'s to determine the approximation complexity of $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$'s using the key claim stated in Step 3.

The first step of our proof strategy described above is quite easy and we intend to present it here.

Lemma 5.2 *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be any constraint set and define $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{EQ}$.*

1. $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{AP} \#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}')$.
2. $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}') \leq_{AP} \#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}')$.

Proof. (1) Obviously, it holds that $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}') \leq_{AP} \#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ because $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$. What still remains is to build the opposite AP-reduction. Now, let Ω be any constraint frame given to $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ with an undirected bipartite graph $G = (V_1 | V_2, E)$, where all nodes in V_1 have variable labels. Note that, whenever there is a node v labeled EQ_d ($d \geq 2$) in V_2 that has two or more edges incident on the *same* node in V_1 , we can delete all but one such edge without changing the outcome of csp_Ω . To keep the node labeling valid, we need to replace the label EQ_d by $EQ_{d'}$, where d' equals $\deg(v)$ in the modified graph. In the following argument, we assume that any node with label EQ_d in V_2 is always adjacent to d *distinct* nodes in V_1 .

Choose any node, say, v whose label is EQ_d ($d \geq 2$) in V_2 . Let us consider a subgraph G_v consisting only of the node v and of all nodes labeled, say, $x_1, \dots, x_d$ adjacent to v , together with all edges between v and those d nodes. The graph G' is also composed of, as dangling edges, all edges that have been linked between any node x_i ($i \in [d]$) and any node in $V_2 - \{v\}$. We first observe that all values of the variables $x_1, \dots, x_d$ should coincide in order to make $EQ_d(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ non-zero. From this property, we merge all the nodes $x_1, \dots, x_d$ into a single node w with a “new” variable label, say, x' and then delete all edges but one that become incident on both w and v , while we keep the dangling edges as all distinct edges. Finally, we label the node v by EQ_1 . Let G'_v be the graph induced from G_v by the above modification. Now, we replace G_v that appears as a subgraph inside G by G'_v . This replacement process is repeated until all nodes labeled EQ_d ($d \geq 2$) are removed. The obtained graph G' has no node whose label is taken from $\mathcal{EQ}$. Let Ω' be the constraint frame associated with G' . Since the replacement does not change the value of csp_Ω , $csp_{\Omega'} = csp_\Omega$ follows, and thus we obtain $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq_{AP} \#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}')$.

(2) Given an input instance $\Omega = (G, X | \mathcal{F}', \pi)$ to $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}')$ with $G = (V_1 | V_2, E)$, we will construct another instance Ω' to $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}')$ by applying the following recursive procedure. Choose any node of degree d ($d \geq 2$) in V_1 and assume that this node has label x . Let $e_1, \dots, e_d$ be the d distinct edges incident on this node x and assume that each e_i ($i \in [d]$) bridges between the node x and a node labeled, say, g_i in $\mathcal{F}'$. Delete this node x and replace it with d “new” nodes having variable labels, say, $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_d$ that do not appear in G . Introduce an additional “new” node, say, v labeled EQ_d to V_2 . For each index $i \in [d]$, we re-attach to node y_i each edge e_i from the node g_i and then make all the nodes $y_1, \dots, y_d$ adjacent to the node v by d “new” edges. Notice that each node y_i ($i \in [d]$) is now adjacent to two nodes v and g_i . We continue this procedure until all original nodes of degree at least two in V_1 are replaced.

To the end, let G' denote the obtained bipartite graph from G and let Ω' be its associated constraint frame. By our construction, any node on the left-hand side of G' has degree exactly two. In addition, no two nodes labeled EQ_d share the same variables. Since $csp_\Omega = csp_{\Omega'}$, obviously holds, the lemma thus follows. $\square$

The reader might wonder why we have used $\mathcal{EQ}$, instead of $\{EQ_2\}$, in the above lemma although any EQ_d can be expressed by a finite chain of EQ_2 's; for instance, $EQ_3(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ equals $EQ_2(x_1, x_2)EQ_2(x_2, x_3)$. The reason we have not used EQ_2 alone in (2) of the above proof is that, after running the construction procedure in (2), any node with a variable label that directly connects two EQ_2 's becomes degree three instead of two, and thus this fact proves $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}') \leq_{AP} \#CSP_3^*(EQ_2 \parallel \mathcal{F}')$, from which we deduce $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{AP} \#CSP_4^*(\mathcal{F})$. This consequence is clearly weaker than what we wish to establish.

In the second step of our strategy, we plan to define an AP-reduction from $\#CSP_2^*(EQ_d \parallel \mathcal{F})$ to $\#CSP_3^*(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F})$. For this purpose, it suffices to prove, as a special case of the following lemma, that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \mathcal{G}$ by a generic and efficient algorithm.

Lemma 5.3 *Let $d, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $d \geq 2$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ be any two constraint sets and assume that $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{EQ} = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{G}$ is finite. If $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+m} \mathcal{G}$, then $\#CSP_2^*(EQ_d \parallel \mathcal{F}) \leq_{AP} \#CSP_{2+m}^*(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F})$. In addition, assume that there exists a procedure of transforming any graph G representing EQ_d into another graph G' realizing EQ_d by $\mathcal{G}$ in time polynomial in the size of d and the size of the graph G . It therefore holds that $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}) \leq_{AP} \#CSP_{2+m}^*(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. Let Ω be any constraint frame given as an input instance to $\#CSP_2^*(EQ_d|\mathcal{F})$, including an undirected bipartite graph $G = (V_1|V_2, E)$. Similarly to the proof of Lemma 5.2(1), we hereafter assume that any node with label EQ_d in V_2 is adjacent to d *distinct* nodes in V_1 .

Now, we will describe a procedure of how to generate a new instance $\tilde{\Omega}$ to $\#CSP_{2+m}^*(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F})$. Let D be the collection of all nodes in V_2 whose labels are EQ_d . The following procedure will remove all nodes in D recursively. Let us pick an arbitrary node v in D and consider any subgraph G' of G satisfying that G' consists only of the node v and d different nodes labeled, say, $x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_d}$ in V_1 that are all adjacent to v . Because of the degree bound of $\#CSP_2^*(EQ_d|\mathcal{F})$, each of those d nodes on the left-hand side of G' should contain at most one dangling edge, which is originally incident on a certain other node in V_2 . Clearly, G' represents EQ_d . Since $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+m} \mathcal{G}$, there exists another undirected bipartite graph G'' that realizes EQ_d by $\mathcal{G}$. Inside the original graph G , we replace this subgraph G' by G'' . Note that, in this replacement, any node other than $x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_d}$ in G'' are treated as “new” nodes; thus, those new nodes are not adjacent to any node outside of G'' . Furthermore, for each dangling edge appearing in G' , we restore its original edge connection to a certain node in V_2 . Clearly, the resulting graph contains less nodes having the label EQ_d . The above process is repeated until all nodes in D are removed.

Let $\tilde{G}$ be the bipartite graph obtained by applying the aforementioned procedure and let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be the new constraint frame associated with $\tilde{G}$. The degree of each node x_i in $\tilde{G}$ is at most m plus the original degree in G since no two nodes labeled EQ_d in G share the same variables. By the realizability notion, it is not difficult to show that $\text{csp}_{\tilde{\Omega}} = \text{csp}_{\Omega}$. This implies that $\#CSP_2^*(EQ_d|\mathcal{F}) \leq_{AP} \#CSP_{2+m}^*(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F})$.

The second part of the lemma comes from the fact that, using the procedure described above, we can construct $\tilde{\Omega}$ from Ω efficiently and robustly if there is a generic procedure that transforms G' to G'' for any degree-bound d in polynomial time. Since the premise of the lemma guarantees the existence of such a generic procedure, we immediately obtain the desired consequence. $\square$

6 Basic AP-Reductions of Binary Constraints

Since we have shown in Section 5 that $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ can be AP-reduced to $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ}|\mathcal{F}')$, where $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{EQ}$, the remaining task is to AP-reduce $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ}|\mathcal{F}')$ further to $\#CSP_3^*(f, \mathcal{F}')$. To fulfill this purpose, it suffices to prove that, for any index $d \geq 2$ and for any constraint $f \in \mathcal{F}$, EQ_d is limited T-constructible from f together with (possibly) a few extra unary constraints while maintaining the degree-bound to three. To be more precise, we want to prove that there exists a finite set $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ for which $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \mathcal{G} \cup \{f\}$.

By examining the proofs of each lemma given below, it is easy to check that the procedure of showing a limited T-constructibility relation $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \mathcal{G} \cup \{f\}$ for each index $d \geq 3$ is indeed “generic” and “efficient,” as requested by Lemma 5.3. Therefore, we will finally conclude that $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ}|\mathcal{F}') \leq_{AP} \#CSP_3^*(f, \mathcal{F}')$.

This section deals only with non-degenerate constraints of arity two, because degenerate constraints have been already handled by Lemma 5.1. The first case to discuss is a constraint f of the form $(0, a, b, 0)$ with $ab \neq 0$, whose underlying relation R_f is *XOR*.

Lemma 6.1 *Let d be any index at least two. Let $f = (0, a, b, 0)$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. If $ab \neq 0$, then $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} f$ holds.*

Proof. From a given constraint $f = (0, a, b, 0)$, we define another constraint g as $g(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}} f(x_1, y)f(y, x_2)$. A direct calculation shows that $g = (ab, 0, 0, ab)$. From this definition of g , we note that (*) the value of y is uniquely determined from (x_1, x_2) if $g(x_1, x_2) \neq 0$. More generally, for each index $d \geq 2$, we define $h(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \sum_{y_1, \dots, y_{d-1} \in \{0,1\}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} (f(x_i, y_i)f(y_i, x_{i+1}))$. Clearly, when $d = 2$, h coincides with g . Because of the uniqueness property of g stated in (*), $h(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ equals $\prod_{i=1}^{d-1} g(x_i, x_{i+1})$. This implies that $h(0, \dots, 0) = h(1, \dots, 1) = (ab)^{d-1}$ and $h(e) = 0$ for any other variable assignment $e \in \{0,1\}^d$. It therefore follows that $h = (ab)^{d-1} \cdot EQ_d$. Since $ab \neq 0$, by normalizing h appropriately, we then obtain EQ_d from h .

Next, we will show that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} f$. Let G be any undirected bipartite graph representing EQ_d with d nodes whose labels are $x_1, \dots, x_d$. Consider a new graph G' obtained from G , using the above equation of h , by adding $d - 1$ “new” nodes labeled $y_1, \dots, y_{d-1}$ and by replacing the node EQ_d in G with $2(d - 1)$ “new” nodes labeled f , each of which is adjacent to two nodes x_i and y_i ($i \in [d - 1]$) or two nodes y_i and x_{i+1} . This bipartite graph G' clearly realizes EQ_d by f . Two special nodes x_1 and x_d in G' maintain their original degree in G , whereas each node x_i except for x_1 and x_d has one more than its original degree in G . In addition, all nodes with the labels $y_1, \dots, y_{d-1}$ are of degree exactly two. Therefore, we conclude that

$EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} f$, as requested. $\square$

As the second case, we will handle a constraint $f = (a, 0, 0, b)$ satisfying $ab \neq 0$. Since its underlying relation is precisely EQ_2 , the proof of its limited T-constructibility is rather simple.

Lemma 6.2 *Let $d \geq 2$ and let $f = (a, 0, 0, b)$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. If $ab \neq 0$, then there exists a constraint $u \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$ such that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f, u\}$.*

Proof. Let $f = (a, 0, 0, b)$ with $ab \neq 0$. First, we consider the base case of $d = 2$. By setting $u = [1/a, 1/b]$, we define a constraint g as $g(x_1, x_2) = u(x_1)f(x_1, x_2)$. Clearly, g equals EQ_2 . For a degree analysis, let us consider any undirected bipartite graph G that represents EQ_d . Since $g = EQ_2$, a new bipartite graph G' is obtained from G by replacing the existing node EQ_d and its associated edges in G with two “new” nodes labeled u and f together with three “new” edges $\{(x_1, u), (x_1, f), (x_2, f)\}$. From this construction, the node x_1 in G' has one more than its original degree in G ; however, the degree of the node x_2 in G' remains the same as that in G . We therefore obtain $EQ_2 \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f, u\}$. This argument will be extended to the general case of $d \geq 2$.

For each fixed index $d \geq 2$, we set $u' = [1/a^d, 1/b^d]$ and define $h(x_1, \dots, x_d) = u'(x_1) \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} f(x_i, x_{i+1})$. It is not difficult to show that h equals EQ_d . Similarly to the base case, from the definition of h , we can build a bipartite graph G' that realizes h by $\{f, u'\}$. In this graph G' , each node x_i ($1 \leq i < d$) has one more than its original degree in G , while the node x_d keeps the same degree as that in G . This fact helps us conclude that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f, u'\}$. $\square$

Our next target is a constraint f of the form $(a, b, 0, c)$ with $abc \neq 0$. The underlying relation of f is exactly *Implies*.

Lemma 6.3 *Let $d \geq 2$. Let $f = (a, b, 0, c)$ with $a, b, c \in \mathbb{C}$. If $abc \neq 0$, then there exist two constraints $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$ for which $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f, u_1, u_2\}$. By permuting variable indices, the case of $(a, 0, b, c)$ is similar.*

Proof. First, we set $f = (a, b, 0, c)$ and assume that $abc \neq 0$. For this constraint f , we prepare the following two unary constraints: $u = [1/a^2, 1/c^2]$ and $u' = [1/a^3, 1/c^3]$. Let us begin with the base case of $d = 2$. In this case, we define $g(x_1, x_2) = f(x_2, x_1) \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}} f(x_1, y)u'(y)f(y, x_2)$. Since u' cancels out the effect of both terms $f(x_2, x_1)$ and $f(x_1, y)f(y, x_2)$, we immediately obtain $g = (1, 0, 0, 1)$.

Let G be any undirected bipartite graph representing EQ_2 with two variables x_1 and x_2 . To obtain another bipartite graph G' realizing EQ_2 , we first build a graph $G^{[f, u']}$ (using u' instead of u), introduced in Example 4.1, which is equipped with all the original dangling edges in G . We next add an extra “new” node with label f that becomes adjacent to the two nodes x_2 and x_1 . This newly constructed graph G' obviously realizes EQ_2 by $\{f, u'\}$. Since G' contains two edges from each node x_i ($i \in \{1, 2\}$), the degree of the node x_i in G' thus increases by one, and therefore $EQ_2 \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f, u'\}$ follows.

In the case of $d \geq 3$, by extending the base case, we naturally define a constraint h as $h(x_1, \dots, x_d) = f(x_d, x_1) \sum_{y_1, \dots, y_{d-1} \in \{0,1\}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} (f(x_i, y_i)u_i(y_i)f(y_i, x_{i+1}))$, where $u_{d-1} = u'$ and $u_i = u$ for each $i \in [d-2]$. Note that u and u' bring the same effect as u' does in the base case. The analysis of the node degrees in the corresponding graph is similar in essence to the degree analysis of the base case. Therefore, it immediately follows that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f, u, u'\}$. $\square$

Unlike the constraints we have discussed so far, the non-degenerate non-zero constraints $f = (1, a, b, c)$ with $a, b, c \in \mathbb{C}$ are quite special, because they appear only in the case of complex-weighted #CSPs. When f is limited to be a Boolean relation, by contrast, it never becomes both non-degenerate and non-zero. Notice that, by Lemma 3.1, $f \notin \mathcal{DG}$ is equivalent to $ab \neq c$.

Lemma 6.4 *Let $d \geq 2$ and let $f = (1, a, b, c)$ with $abc \neq 0$. If $ab \neq c$, then there exist two constraints $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$ satisfying that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f, u_1, u_2\}$.*

Proof. Let $f = (1, a, b, c)$ be any binary constraint satisfying that $abc \neq 0$ and $ab \neq c$. Now, we set $u_1 = [1, z]$ and define g as $g(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}} f(x_1, y)u_1(y)f(y, x_2)$. This gives $g = (1 + abz, a(1 + cz), b(1 + cz), ab + c^2z)$. If we choose $z = -1/c$, then the constraint g becomes of the form $(1 - ab/c, 0, 0, ab - c)$. Note that, since $ab \neq c$, the first and last entries of g are non-zero. By appealing to (the proof of) Lemma 6.2, which requires another non-zero unary constraint u_2 , the new constraint $g'(x_1, x_2) = u_2(x_1)g(x_1, x_2)$ equals $EQ_2(x_1, x_2)$.

To show $EQ_2 \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f, u_1, u_2\}$, from any undirected bipartite graph G representing EQ_2 with variables x_1

and x_2 , we construct another graph G' by taking $G^{[f, u_1]}$ (stated in Example 4.1) with the original dangling edges in G and further by adding a “new” node labeled u_2 that is adjacent to the node x_1 . Overall, the degree of any node on the left-hand side of G' increases by at most one in comparison with the degree of the same node in G .

In a more general case of $d \geq 3$, with a series $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ of d variables, we define $g(x) = \sum_{y_1, \dots, y_{d-1} \in \{0,1\}} \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} (f(x_i, y_i) u_1(y_i) f(y_i, x_{i+1}))$. Since g has the form $(a', 0, \dots, 0, b')$, with an appropriate constraint $u'_2 \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$, the constraint $g'(x) = u'_2(x_1)g(x)$ coincides with EQ_d . A degree analysis of a graph realizing EQ_d is similar to the base case. We therefore obtain $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f, u_1, u'_2\}$. $\square$

As a summary of Lemmas 6.1–6.4, we wish to make a general claim on binary constraints that do not belong to $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$. This claim will be a basis of the proof of Proposition 7.3.

Proposition 6.5 *Let $d \geq 2$. For any non-degenerate binary constraint f , if $f \notin \mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$, then there exists a constraint set $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$ with $|\mathcal{G}| \leq 2$ such that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \mathcal{G} \cup \{f\}$.*

Proof. Let $f = (a, b, c, d)$ be any non-degenerate constraint. It is important to note that $f \notin \mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND}$ iff f is one of the following forms: $(0, b, c, 0)$, $(a, 0, 0, d)$, $(a, 0, c, d)$, $(a, b, 0, d)$, and (a, b, c, d) , provided that $abcd \neq 0$. In particular, for the last form (a, b, c, d) , since $f \notin \mathcal{DG}$, Lemma 3.1 yields the inequality $ad \neq bc$. All the above five forms have been already dealt with in Lemmas 6.1–6.4, and therefore the lemma should hold. $\square$

The most notable case is where $f = (0, a, b, c)$ or $f = (a, b, c, 0)$ with $abc \neq 0$. These two constraints respectively extend OR_2 and $NAND_2$ from Boolean values to complex values. Our result below contrasts complex-weighted constraints with unweighted constraints, because this result is not known to hold for the Boolean constraints.

Proposition 6.6 *Let $d \geq 2$. If $f = (0, a, b, c)$ with $abc \neq 0$, then there exists a constraint $u \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$ such that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f, u\}$. A similar statement holds for $f = (a, b, c, 0)$ with $abc \neq 0$.*

The proof of this proposition utilizes two useful lemmas, Lemmas 6.7 and 6.8, which are described below. In the first lemma, we want to show that two constraints whose underlying relations are OR_2 and $NAND_2$ together help compute EQ_d for any index $d \geq 2$.

Lemma 6.7 *Let $d \geq 2$. Let $f_1 = (0, a, b, c)$ and $f_2 = (a', b', c', 0)$ with $a, b, c, a', b', c' \in \mathbb{C}$. If $ab \neq 0$ and $b'c' \neq 0$, then $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f_1, f_2\}$.*

Proof. Let $f_1 = (0, a, b, c)$ and $f_2 = (a', b', c', 0)$ with $abb'c' \neq 0$. First, we explain our construction for the base case of $d = 2$. By defining $g(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{y_1, y_2 \in \{0,1\}} f_1(x_1, y_1) f_1(y_2, x_2) f_2(y_1, x_2) f_2(x_1, y_2)$, g becomes of the form $(abb'c', 0, 0, abb'c')$, from which we immediately obtain $EQ_2 = (1, 0, 0, 1)$ by normalizing it since $abb'c' \neq 0$. Let $G = (V_1 | V_2, E)$ be any undirected bipartite graph representing EQ_2 . Based on the definition of g , we will construct an appropriate bipartite graph G' from G as follows. We first introduce two additional nodes labeled y_1 and y_2 into V_1 . In place of the node labeled EQ_2 in V_2 , we next add two “fresh” nodes with the same label f_1 , which respectively become adjacent to the two nodes x_1 and y_1 and to the two nodes y_2 and x_2 , and we also add two “fresh” nodes having the same label f_2 , which are respectively adjacent to the nodes y_1 and x_2 and to the nodes x_1 and y_2 . The degree of each node x_i ($i \in [2]$) in G' increases by one from its original degree in G , because each node x_i is linked in G' to the two nodes with labels f_1 and f_2 . Moreover, the new nodes y_1 and y_2 have degree exactly two. It therefore holds that $EQ_2 \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f_1, f_2\}$.

In what follows, we assume $d \geq 3$ and focus on the case where d is even. We will extend the argument used in the base case. Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$ be two series of distinct variables. We then introduce two useful constraints g_1 and g_2 defined by $g_1(x, y) = \prod_{i=0}^{d/2-1} (f_1(x_{2i+1}, y_{2i+1}) f_1(y_{2i+2}, x_{2i+2}))$ and $g_2(x, y) = \left(\prod_{i=0}^{d/2-1} f_2(y_{2i+1}, x_{2i+2}) \right) \left(\prod_{i=0}^{d/2-2} f_2(x_{2i+3}, y_{2i+2}) \right)$. With these new constraints, we define $h(x) = \sum_{y_1, \dots, y_d \in \{0,1\}} g_1(x, y) g_2(x, y) f_2(x_1, y_d)$. By a straightforward calculation, it is not difficult to check that h truly computes $\lambda \cdot EQ_d$ for a certain constant $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} - \{0\}$. Similar to the construction of the base case, from a graph G representing EQ_d , we can construct a new bipartite graph G' that realizes EQ_d by $\{f_1, f_2\}$. The degree of every node x_i ($i \in [d]$) in G' is one more than its original degree in G , whereas all nodes y_j ($j \in [d]$) in G' are of degree two. Thus, we conclude that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f_1, f_2\}$.

When d is odd, we initially introduce a fresh variable called x_{d+1} as a “dummy.” After defining $h(x_1, \dots, x_{d+1})$ as done before, we need to define $h' = h^{x_{d+1}=*}$, which turns out to equal $\lambda' \cdot EQ_d$ for an appropriate non-zero constant λ' . The degree analysis of G' is similar to the even case. Therefore, the

proof is completed. $\square$

The second lemma ensures that, with a help of unary constraint, we can transform a constraint in $\mathcal{DISJ}$ into another in $\mathcal{NAND}$ without increasing the degree of its realizing graph. This is a special phenomenon not seen for Boolean constraints and it clearly exemplifies a power of the *weighted* unary constraints.

Lemma 6.8 *For any binary constraint $h \in \mathcal{NZ}$, there exist a binary constraint $h' \in \mathcal{NZ}$ and a unary constraint $u \in \mathcal{NZ}$ such that $\text{NAND}_2 \cdot h' \leq_{\text{con}}^{+0} \{\text{OR}_2 \cdot h, u\}$. A similar statement holds if we exchange the roles of OR_2 and NAND_2 .*

Proof. Let $f = \text{OR}_2 \cdot h$ for a given constraint $h \in \mathcal{NZ}$ of arity two. By normalizing f appropriately, we assume, without loss of generality, that f is of the form $(0, a, b, 1)$, where $ab \neq 0$. With a use of an extra constraint $u = [1, z]$, let us define $g(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}} f(x_1, y)u(y)f(y, x_2)$, which implies $g = (abz, az, bz, ab + z)$. Hence, if we set $z = -ab$, then g equals $(-(ab)^2, -a^2b, -ab^2, 0)$. We then define the desired h' as $(-(ab)^2, -a^2b, -ab^2, 1)$, which is obviously a non-zero constraint. Obviously, $g(x_1, x_2)$ coincides with $\text{NAND}_2(x_1, x_2)h'(x_1, x_2)$; thus, we obtain $g = \text{NAND}_2 \cdot h'$.

Next, we want to show that $g \leq_{\text{con}}^{+0} \{f, u\}$. Against any graph G representing g , we define G' to be the graph $G^{[f, u]}$, stated in Example 4.1, together with all dangling edges appearing in G . Recall that $G^{[f, u]}$ is comprised of nodes labeled x_1, x_2 , and y . The degree of the node y in G' is three and the other variable nodes have the same degree as their original ones in G . It therefore follows that $g \leq_{\text{con}}^{+0} \{f, u\}$. $\square$

Finally, we are ready to give the proof of Proposition 6.6.

Proof of Proposition 6.6. Let $d \geq 2$ and let $f = (0, a, b, c)$ with $abc \neq 0$. By setting $h = (1, a, b, c) \in \mathcal{NZ}$, we obtain $f(x_1, x_2) = \text{OR}_2(x_1, x_2)h(x_1, x_2)$. By Lemma 6.8, there are two constraints $u \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$ and $h' \in \mathcal{NZ}$ of arity two for which $g \leq_{\text{con}}^{+0} \{f, u\}$ and $g = \text{NAND}_2 \cdot h'$. Note that, since $h' \in \mathcal{NZ}$, g should have the form $(a', b', c', 0)$ for certain constants $a', b', c' \in \mathbb{C}$ with $a'b'c' \neq 0$. Now, we apply Lemma 6.7 to f and g and then obtain $EQ_d \leq_{\text{con}}^{+1} \{f, g\}$. Combining this with $g \leq_{\text{con}}^{+0} \{f, u\}$, Lemma 4.3 draws the desired conclusion that $EQ_d \leq_{\text{con}}^{+1} \{f, u\}$. $\square$

7 Constraints of Higher Arity

We have shown in Section 6 that the equality EQ of arbitrary arity can be limited T-constructible from non-degenerate binary constraints. Here, we want to prove a similar result for constraints of three or higher arities. Since constraints in $\mathcal{ED}$ already fall into $\text{FP}_{\mathbb{C}}$, it suffices for us to concentrate on the following two types of constraints: (i) constraints within $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} - \mathcal{DG}$ and (ii) constraints outside of $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$. These types will be discussed in two separate subsections.

7.1 Constraints in $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} - \mathcal{DG}$

First, we will focus our attention on constraints residing in $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} - \mathcal{DG}$. Proposition 6.6 has already handled binary constraints chosen from $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} - \mathcal{DG}$ with an argument that looks quite different from the unweighted case of Dyer et al. [11]. We will show that this result can be extended to constraints of arbitrary high arity.

Proposition 7.1 *Let $k \geq 2$ and $d \geq 2$. Let f be any k -ary constraint in $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND}$. If $f \notin \mathcal{DG}$, then there exists a non-zero unary constraint u such that $EQ_d \leq_{\text{con}}^{+1} \{f, u, \Delta_0, \Delta_1\}$. Moreover, it holds that $\#\text{CSP}_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \#\text{CSP}_3^*(f, \mathcal{F})$ for any constraint set $\mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{EQ} = \emptyset$.*

Before proving this proposition, we will show below a useful lemma, which requires the following terminology. The *width* of a constraint f in $\mathcal{DISJ}$ ($\mathcal{NAND}$, resp.) is the maximal arity of any factor that appears in a unique or-distinctive (nand-distinctive, resp.) factor list for the underlying relation R_f . For each index $w \geq 2$, we denote $\mathcal{DISJ}_w$ ($\mathcal{NAND}_w$, resp.) the set of all constraints in $\mathcal{DISJ}$ ($\mathcal{NAND}$, resp.) of width *exactly* w . Note that $\mathcal{DISJ} = \bigcup_{w \geq 2} \mathcal{DISJ}_w$ and $\mathcal{NAND} = \bigcup_{w \geq 2} \mathcal{NAND}_w$.

Lemma 7.2 *Let $w \geq 2$ be any width index. For any constraint $f \in \mathcal{DISJ}_w$ ($\mathcal{NAND}_w$, resp.), there exists a non-zero constraint h of arity w satisfying that $\text{OR}_w \cdot h \leq_{\text{con}}^{+0} \{f, \Delta_1\}$ ($\text{NAND}_w \cdot h \leq_{\text{con}}^{+0} \{f, \Delta_0\}$, resp.).*

Proof. In this proof, we will show the lemma only for $\mathcal{DISJ}_w$ because the other case, $\mathcal{NAND}_w$, is similar. Assume that $w \geq 2$. Let $k \geq 2$ and let $f \in \mathcal{DISJ}_w$ be any arity- k constraint with k variables $x_1, \dots, x_k$. Notice that the arity of f should be more than or equal to w . We can express f as $R_f \cdot h$ using an appropriate k -ary constraint $h \in \mathcal{NZ}$. Hereafter, we look into the underlying relation R_f . Let us consider a unique or-distinctive factor list L for R_f . Since L should contain at least one OR of arity w , f does not belong to $\mathcal{DG}$. By pinning f , we want to construct a constraint g whose underlying relation equals a factor OR_w in L . For this purpose, we describe below a two-step procedure of how to build such a constraint g .

(1) If there exists a factor of the form $\Delta_c(x)$ ($c \in \{0, 1\}$) in L , then, by assigning the value c to the variable x , we obtain a pinned constraint $g' = f^{x=c}$. Since the or-distinctiveness forbids both factors Δ_c and OR in L to share the same variables, this pinning operation makes g' becomes neither an all-0 function nor an all-1 function.

(2) After recursively applying (1), we now assume that there is no factor of the form Δ_c in L . Let us choose an OR_w in L . For simplicity, by permuting variable indices, we assume that this OR_w takes w distinct variables $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_w$. By assigning 1 to all the other variables $x_{w+1}, \dots, x_k$, we obtain $g = f^{x_{w+1}=1, \dots, x_k=1}$, which obviously implies $R_g = R_f^{x_{w+1}=1, \dots, x_k=1}$. By Example 4.2, it holds that $g \leq_{con}^{+0} \{f, \Delta_1\}$. Since no variable set of any other OR in L becomes a subset of $\{x_1, \dots, x_w\}$, R_g actually coincides with the given OR_w .

To end the proof, we set $h' = h^{x_{w+1}=1, \dots, x_k=1}$, implying that h' is of arity w . With this h' , the constraint g can be expressed as $g = R_g \cdot h'$, and thus g equals $OR_w \cdot h'$ since $R_g = OR_w$. Notice that $h' \in \mathcal{NZ}$ since $h \in \mathcal{NZ}$. Moreover, since $g \leq_{con}^{+0} \{f, \Delta_1\}$, the constraint $OR_w \cdot h'$ is limited T-constructible from $\{f, \Delta_1\}$. This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Proposition 7.1 follows directly from Lemma 7.2 together with Proposition 6.6.

Proof of Proposition 7.1. Assume that $f \in \mathcal{DISJ}$ and f has arity k . In addition, we assume that f has width w for a certain number $w \geq 2$; namely, $f \in \mathcal{DISJ}_w$. Notice that $k \geq w$. Lemma 7.2 ensures the existence of a constraint $h \in \mathcal{NZ}$ of arity w for which $OR_w \cdot h \leq_{con}^{+0} \{f, \Delta_1\}$.

Assume that this relation OR_w takes w distinct variables, say, $x_1, \dots, x_w$. We then choose two specific variables, x_1 and x_2 , and assign 0 to all the other variables. Let f' be the constraint obtained from $OR_w \cdot h$ by performing these pinning operations. By the construction of f' , Example 4.2 implies $f' \leq_{con}^{+0} \{f, \Delta_0, \Delta_1\}$. It is not difficult to show that, since $h \in \mathcal{NZ}$, $R_{f'}(x_1, x_2)$ equals $OR_2(x_1, x_2)$; in other words, f' is of the form $(0, a, b, c)$ with $abc \neq 0$.

Finally, we apply Proposition 6.6 and then obtain a constraint $u \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$ satisfying that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f', u\}$. We combine this with $f' \leq_{con}^{+0} \{f, \Delta_0, \Delta_1\}$ to conclude by Lemma 4.3 that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f, u, \Delta_0, \Delta_1\}$. The case where $f \in \mathcal{NAND}$ is similarly treated.

The second part of the proposition follows by Lemma 5.3 from the fact that the above procedure is indeed generic and efficient. $\square$

7.2 Constraints Outside of $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$

The remaining type of constraints to discuss is ones that sit outside of $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$. As a key claim for those constraints, we will prove the following proposition.

Proposition 7.3 *Let d and k be any two indices at least two. For any constraint f of arity k , if $f \notin \mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$, then there exists a finite subset $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathcal{U}$ such that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \mathcal{G} \cup \{f\}$. In addition, it holds that $\#\text{CSP}_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}) \leq_{AP} \#\text{CSP}_3^*(f, \mathcal{F})$ for any constraint set $\mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{EQ} = \emptyset$.*

This proposition will be proven by induction on the arity of a given constraint f . As our starting point, we want to prove a useful lemma regarding non-degenerate constraints of particular form.

Lemma 7.4 *Let $k \geq 3$. Let f be any non-degenerate constraint of arity k . If $f^{x_1=0}, f^{x_1=1} \in \mathcal{DG}$, then there exists a non-degenerate constraint h of arity $k-1$ for which $h \leq_{con}^{+0} \mathcal{G} \cup \{f\}$ for a certain finite subset $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$.*

Proof. For any fixed index $k \geq 3$, let us choose any arity- k constraint f not in $\mathcal{DG}$ and set $g_b = f^{x_1=b}$ for every index $b \in \{0, 1\}$. Assume that g_0 and g_1 are degenerate. First, we define a “factor list” for g_b . Since $g_b \in \mathcal{DG}$, $g_b(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k)$ can be expressed as $\alpha' g_{b,2}(x_2) g_{b,3}(x_3) \cdots g_{b,k}(x_k)$, where α' is an appropriate constant in $\mathbb{C} - \{0\}$ and each $g_{b,i}$ has one of the following forms: $\Delta_0(x_i)$, $\Delta_1(x_i)$, and $[1, a](x_i)$ with $a \neq 0$.

We call the set $L_b = \{g_{b,2}(x_2), g_{b,3}(x_3), \dots, g_{b,k}(x_k)\}$ (ignoring the global constant α') a *factor list* for g_b . Such a factor list is obviously unique.

(1) If L_0 and L_1 share the same factor of the form, $\Delta_0(x_i)$, $\Delta_1(x_i)$, or $[1, 1](x_i)$ for a certain index i with $2 \leq i \leq k$, then we define $h = f^{x_i=*}$. In case of $\Delta_0(x_i)$, for example, it holds that $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) = \Delta_0(x_i)h(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k)$. From this equation, if h is degenerate, then f should be degenerate, contradicting our assumption. Thus, h cannot be degenerate. The other cases are similar. Obviously, the arity of h is exactly $k - 1$. Since $h \leq_{con}^{+0} f$, we immediately obtain the lemma.

(2) Hereafter, we assume that Case (1) never occurs; namely, $L_0 \cap L_1 = \emptyset$. Let us discuss several cases separately.

(i) Assume that, for a certain index i , L_1 contains a factor $\Delta_0(x_i)$ and L_2 contains $\Delta_1(x_i)$. For ease of the description below, we set $i = 2$. By the definition of g_0 , there exists a degenerate constraint g'_0 such that $g_0(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k)$ equals $\Delta_0(x_2)g'_0(x_3, \dots, x_k)$. Similarly, $g_1(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k)$ is of the form $\Delta_1(x_2)g'_1(x_3, \dots, x_k)$ for a certain $g'_1 \in \mathcal{DG}$. For the desired h , we define $h = f^{x_2=*}$, which implies that $h^{x_1=0} = g'_0$ and $h^{x_1=1} = g'_1$. Obviously, $g \leq_{con}^{+0} f$ holds. Now, we want to claim that $h \notin \mathcal{DG}$. Toward a contradiction, we assume otherwise. This yields an equation $h^{x_1=0} = \gamma \cdot h^{x_1=1}$ for a certain non-zero constant γ ; in other words, $g'_0 = \gamma \cdot g'_1$ holds. Let us consider two factor lists L'_0 and L'_1 for g'_0 and g'_1 , respectively. Since $g'_0 = \gamma \cdot g'_1$, those two factor lists must coincide. Since $L'_0 \subseteq L_0$ and $L'_1 \subseteq L_1$, we conclude that $L_0 \cap L_1 \neq \emptyset$. This is a contradiction against $L_0 \cap L_1 = \emptyset$. Therefore, $h \notin \mathcal{DG}$ follows. This h satisfies the lemma since h 's arity is $k - 1$.

(ii) Consider the case where L_1 contains $\Delta_0(x_i)$ and L_2 contains $[1, a](x_i)$. As before, we set $i = 2$. Assume that $g_0(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k) = \Delta_0(x_2)g'_0(x_3, \dots, x_k)$ and $g_1(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k) = [1, a](x_2)g'_1(x_3, \dots, x_k)$ for two degenerate constraints g'_0 and g'_1 . First, we select a non-zero constant ξ for which $1 + a\xi \neq 0$. With this constant, we then define $h(x_1, x_3, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}} f(x_1, y, x_3, \dots, x_k)[1, \xi](y)$. A simple calculation shows that $h^{x_1=0} = g'_0$ and $h^{x_1=1} = (1 + a\xi) \cdot g'_1$. Note that $[1, \xi] \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$ and $h \leq_{con}^{+0} \{f, [1, \xi]\}$. If $h \in \mathcal{DG}$, then an argument similar to (i) proves that $L_0 \cap L_1 \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. Hence, we conclude that $h \notin \mathcal{DG}$, ensuring the lemma.

(iii) Let us assume that L_1 contains $[1, a](x_i)$ and L_2 contains $[1, b](x_i)$ with $ab \neq 0$. Set $i = 2$ for simplicity. Assume that g_0 and g_1 are of the form: $g_0(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k) = [1, a](x_2)g'_0(x_3, \dots, x_k)$ and $g_1(x_2, x_3, \dots, x_k) = [1, b](x_2)g'_1(x_3, \dots, x_k)$ for certain constraints $g'_0, g'_1 \in \mathcal{DG}$. To obtain the lemma, here we first choose a non-zero constant ξ to satisfy that $\xi + a \neq 0$ and $\xi + b \neq 0$. The desired h is now defined as $h(x_1, x_3, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}} f(x_1, y, x_3, \dots, x_k)[\xi, 1](y)$. It then holds that $h^{x_1=0} = (\xi + a) \cdot g'_0$ and $h^{x_1=1} = (\xi + b) \cdot g'_1$. When $h \in \mathcal{DG}$, $(\xi + a) \cdot g'_0 = \gamma(\xi + b) \cdot g'_1$ holds for a non-zero constant γ . Since both values $\xi + a$ and $\gamma(\xi + b)$ are not zero, a similar argument to (i) leads to a contradiction. Therefore, we obtain $h \notin \mathcal{DG}$, as required.

(iv) The other cases are similar to (i)–(iii). □

The second step for the proof of Proposition 7.3 is made by the following lemma.

Lemma 7.5 *Let $d \geq 2$ and $k \geq 3$. For any k -ary constraint $f \notin \mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$, if $EQ_d \not\leq_{con}^{+1} \mathcal{G} \cup \{f\}$ for any finite set $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, then there exists another constraint g of arity $k - 1$ such that $g \notin \mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$ and $g \leq_{con}^{+0} \mathcal{G}' \cup \{f\}$ for a certain finite set $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$.*

Proof. Let $f \notin \mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$ be any k -ary constraint. Assume that $EQ_d \not\leq_{con}^{+1} \mathcal{G} \cup \{f\}$ for any finite set $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. With constraints $g_b = f^{x_1=b}$ for two values $b \in \{0, 1\}$, it holds that $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}} \Delta_b(x_1)g_b(x_2, \dots, x_k)$. Obviously, both g_0 and g_1 have arity $k - 1$ and $g_b \leq_{con}^{+0} \{f, \Delta_b\}$ holds by Example 4.2 for any $b \in \{0, 1\}$. If either g_0 or g_1 stays out of $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$, then we immediately obtain the lemma. Henceforth, we assume that $g_0, g_1 \in \mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$.

Let us consider g_0 first. If g_0 belongs to $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} - \mathcal{DG}$, then Proposition 7.1 yields $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{g_0, u, \Delta_0, \Delta_1\}$ for a certain constraint $u \in \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$. Since $g_0 \leq_{con}^{+0} \{f, \Delta_0\}$, we reach the conclusion that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \{f, u, \Delta_0, \Delta_1\}$ by Lemma 4.3. This obviously contradicts our assumption. A similar contradiction is drawn if we exchange the roles of g_0 and g_1 . Therefore, there is only one remaining case $g_0, g_1 \in \mathcal{DG}$ to examine. By Lemma 7.4, since $f \notin \mathcal{DG}$, we immediately obtain a non-degenerate constraint g of arity $k - 1$ such that $g \leq_{con}^{+0} \mathcal{G} \cup \{f\}$ for a certain finite set $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$. If this g is actually in $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND}$, then we conclude, as before, that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \mathcal{G}' \cup \{f\}$ for another finite subset $\mathcal{G}'$ of $\mathcal{U}$. Since this is a contradiction,

it thus follows that $g \notin \mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$. The constraint g certainly satisfies the lemma. $\square$

In the end, we will prove Proposition 7.3 by combining Proposition 6.5 and Lemma 7.5.

Proof of Proposition 7.3. Let $k \geq 2$ and let f be any k -ary constraint not in $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$. Our proof proceeds by induction on the arity k of f .

[Basis Case: $k = 2$] For this basis case, Proposition 6.5 gives the desired conclusion of the proposition.

[Induction Case: $k \geq 3$] Our goal is to show that $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \mathcal{G} \cup \{f\}$ for a certain set $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. Toward a contradiction, we assume on the contrary that $EQ_d \not\leq_{con}^{+1} \mathcal{G} \cup \{f\}$ for any finite subset $\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathcal{U}$. By Lemma 7.5, there is a constraint g of arity $< k$ for which $g \notin \mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$ and $g \leq_{con}^{+0} \mathcal{G}' \cup \{f\}$ for a certain finite set $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{NZ}$. We apply the induction hypothesis to this g and then obtain $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \mathcal{G}'' \cup \{g\}$ for another finite set $\mathcal{G}'' \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. Since $g \leq_{con}^{+0} \mathcal{G}' \cup \{f\}$, $EQ_d \leq_{con}^{+1} \mathcal{G}' \cup \mathcal{G}'' \cup \{f\}$ follows from Lemma 4.3. This is clearly a contradiction; therefore, the proposition holds for f .

Moreover, we obtain the second part of the proposition by appealing to Lemma 5.3, because the above proof can be efficiently simulated. $\square$

8 The Dichotomy Theorem

Throughout the previous sections, we have already established all necessary foundations for our main theorem—Theorem 1.1—on the approximation complexity of complex-weighted bounded-degree Boolean #CSPs. Here, we re-state this theorem, which has appeared first in Section 1.

Theorem 1.1 (rephrased) Let $d \geq 3$ be any degree bound and let $\mathcal{F}$ be any set of constraints. If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{ED}$, then $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$ belongs to $FP_{\mathbb{C}}$. Otherwise, $\#SAT_{\mathbb{C}} \leq_{AP} \#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$.

This theorem is an immediate consequence of our key claim, Proposition 1.2, which directly bridges between unbounded-degree #CSPs and bounded-degree #CSPs, when unary constraints are freely available. Once the claim is proven, the theorem follows from the dichotomy theorem (stated in Section 1) of Yamakami [21]. Now, we aim at proving Proposition 1.2.

Proposition 1.2 (rephrased) For any index $d \geq 3$ and for any constraint set $\mathcal{F}$, $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{AP} \#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$.

Proof. Let d be any index at least 3. Obviously, it holds that $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F}) \leq_{AP} \#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$. It thus suffices to show the opposite direction of this AP-reduction. For convenience, set $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{EQ}$.

Let us consider the case where $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{ED}$. Lemma 5.1 directly shows that $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F}) \in FP_{\mathbb{C}}$. Since $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ is also in $FP_{\mathbb{C}}$ [21], $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{AP} \#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$ follows immediately. Hereafter, let us assume that $\mathcal{F} \not\subseteq \mathcal{ED}$. Note that Lemma 5.2 helps us AP-reduce $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ to $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}')$. Now, we want to prove that $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}')$ is AP-reducible to $\#CSP_d^*(f, \mathcal{F}')$ for an appropriate constraint $f \in \mathcal{F}$. This leads us to the conclusion that $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}') \leq_{AP} \#CSP_d^*(f, \mathcal{F}')$ since $\{f\} \cup \mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$.

Let us consider the case where either $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND}$. Since $\mathcal{F} \not\subseteq \mathcal{ED}$ implies $\mathcal{F} \not\subseteq \mathcal{DG}$, there exists a constraint f in $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} - \mathcal{DG}$. The arity of f should be at least 2 since $f \notin \mathcal{DG}$. To this f , we apply Proposition 7.1 and then obtain $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}') \leq_{AP} \#CSP_3^*(f, \mathcal{F}')$. Since $d \geq 3$, we conclude that $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}') \leq_{AP} \#CSP_d^*(f, \mathcal{F}')$. The remaining case is that $\mathcal{F}$ is not included in $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$. Now, we choose a constraint $f \in \mathcal{F}$ that does not belong to $\mathcal{DISJ} \cup \mathcal{NAND} \cup \mathcal{DG}$. Such a constraint can be handled by Proposition 7.3. We thus obtain $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}') \leq_{AP} \#CSP_3^*(f, \mathcal{F}')$, which immediately implies $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{EQ} \parallel \mathcal{F}') \leq_{AP} \#CSP_d^*(f, \mathcal{F}')$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 1.2 is a consequence of the powerful expressiveness of complex-weighted free unary constraints. When free unary constraints are limited to Boolean, Dyer et al. [11] showed a similar proposition only under the assumption that every Boolean constraint in $\mathcal{F}$ is “3-simulatable.”

Now, Theorem 1.1 is immediate from Proposition 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $d \geq 3$. If $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{ED}$ holds, then $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$ belongs to $FP_{\mathbb{C}}$ by Lemma 5.1. When $\mathcal{F} \not\subseteq \mathcal{ED}$, as noted in Section 1, it was shown in [21] that $\#SAT_{\mathbb{C}} \leq_{AP} \#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$. Since Proposition 1.2 establishes the AP-equivalence between $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ and $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$, we can replace $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ in the above result by $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$. This clearly gives the desired consequence of the theorem. $\square$

Another immediate consequence of Proposition 1.2 is an AP-equivalence between $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ and a bipartite Holant problem $\text{Holant}(EQ_3 | \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$. This immediately follows from the proposition and also a known

fact that degree-3 #CSPs are essentially identical to bipartite Holant problems whose node labels appearing on the left-hand side of input graphs are always restricted to EQ_3 . To make this paper self-contained, we will include the detailed proof of the AP-equivalence between $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$ and $\text{Holant}(EQ_3|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$.

Corollary 8.1 *For any set $\mathcal{F}$ of constraints, it holds that $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \text{Holant}(EQ_3|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an arbitrary set of constraints. Since $\#CSP_3^*(\mathcal{F})$ is shorthand for $\#CSP_3(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$, by Proposition 1.2, it is enough to prove that $\#CSP_3(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$ and $\text{Holant}(EQ_3|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$ are AP-equivalent. Recall from Section 2.3 that $\#CSP(\mathcal{G})$ always coincides with $\text{Holant}(\{EQ_k\}_{k \geq 1}|\mathcal{G})$ for any constraint set $\mathcal{G}$. In particular, $\#CSP_3(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$ coincides with $\text{Holant}(EQ_1, EQ_2, EQ_3|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$. Our goal is therefore set to show that $\text{Holant}(EQ_1, EQ_2, EQ_3|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \text{Holant}(EQ_3|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$.

Let us consider any bipartite signature grid $\Omega = (G, \mathcal{F}'_1|\mathcal{F}'_2, \pi)$ given as an input instance to $\text{Holant}(EQ_1, EQ_2, EQ_3|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$, where $\mathcal{F}'_1 \subseteq \{EQ_1, EQ_2, EQ_3\}$ and $\mathcal{F}'_2 \subseteq \mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{U}$. Moreover, assume that $G = (V_1|V_2, E)$. Now, we will describe how to replace every node labeled EQ_1 with another node whose label is EQ_3 . For any node v having the label EQ_1 that appears in V_1 , let w denote any node, adjacent to v , whose label is, say, $g \in \mathcal{F}'_2$. Take any bipartite subgraph $G' = (\{v\}|\{w\}, E')$, where E' consists of the edge (v, w) and of all dangling edges obtained from the edges linking between the node g and any node other than v in V_1 . We then replace this subgraph G' inside G with the following four-node subgraph $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{V}_1|\tilde{V}_2, \tilde{E})$: $\tilde{V}_1$ is composed of a node v' labeled EQ_3 , $\tilde{V}_2$ contains three nodes w_1, w_2, w_3 , one of which is labeled g and the others are labeled EQ_1 , and $\tilde{E}$ consists of three edges (v', w_i) for all $i \in [3]$ and the original dangling edges incident on the node g . Let Ω' be the bipartite signature grid obtained from Ω by replacing all nodes labeled EQ_1 in V_1 . Thus, Ω' is an input instance to $\text{Holant}(EQ_2, EQ_3|EQ_1, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$, which coincides with $\text{Holant}(EQ_2, EQ_3|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$ because of $EQ_1 \in \mathcal{U}$. Note that the aforementioned replacement of two subgraphs does not change the value of Holant_Ω , and therefore we obtain $\text{Holant}_{\Omega'} = \text{Holant}_\Omega$.

Similarly, we can replace EQ_2 by EQ_3 . When all nodes labeled EQ_1 and EQ_2 are replaced, we then establish the desired AP-reduction from $\text{Holant}(EQ_1, EQ_2, EQ_3|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$ to $\text{Holant}(EQ_3|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$. $\square$

9 Cases of Degree 1 and Degree 2

When the degree bound d is more than two, our main theorem—Theorem 1.1—has given a complete characterization of the approximation complexity of counting problems $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$ for any constraint set $\mathcal{F}$. This has left a question of what the approximation complexity of $\#CSP_d^*(\mathcal{F})$ is, when d is less than three. We briefly discuss this issue in this section. Let us consider the trivial case of degree one.

Lemma 9.1 *For any constraint set $\mathcal{F}$, $\#CSP_1^*(\mathcal{F})$ is in $\text{FP}_{\mathbb{C}}$.*

Proof. Let $\Omega = (G, X|\mathcal{F}', \pi)$ be any given constraint frame for $\#CSP_1^*(\mathcal{F})$. Note that all nodes on the left-hand side of the undirected bipartite graph G have degree at most one. By this degree requirement, no two edges in G are incident on the same node on the left-hand side of G . In other words, any two constraints in $\mathcal{F}'$ share no single variable. This makes csp_Ω equal to a product of all values $\sum_{\sigma} f(\sigma(x_{i_1}), \sigma'(x_{i_2}), \dots, \sigma'(x_{i_k}))$ for any constraint $f \in \mathcal{F}'$ that takes a variable series $(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_k})$, where “sum” is taken over all variable assignments $\sigma : \{x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_k}\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. This value can be easily computed from all constraints in $\mathcal{F}'$ in polynomial time. Therefore, $\#CSP_1^*(\mathcal{F})$ belongs to $\text{FP}_{\mathbb{C}}$. $\square$

Next, we consider the case of degree two. Earlier, Dyer et al. [11] left this case unanswered for unweighted Boolean #CSPs. For a complex-weighted case, however, it is possible to obtain a precise characterization of $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{F})$ ’s using a known transformation between degree-2 #CSPs and Holant problems. For completeness, we will formally prove that $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{F})$ is indeed AP-equivalent to $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$. To simplify the description of Holant problems, similar to the notation $\#CSP^*(\mathcal{F})$, we succinctly write $\text{Holant}^*(\mathcal{F})$ for $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$.

Proposition 9.2 *For any constraint set $\mathcal{F}$, it holds that $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \text{Holant}^*(\mathcal{F})$.*

Proof. Firstly, we will claim that $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{F})$ is AP-equivalent to $\text{Holant}(EQ_2|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$. Secondly, we will claim that $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \text{Holant}(EQ_2|\mathcal{F})$. By replacing $\mathcal{F}$ by $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{U}$, we immediately obtain $\text{Holant}^*(\mathcal{F}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \text{Holant}(EQ_2|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$. By combining these two claims, the proposition clearly follows.

(1) The first claim is proven as follows. In the proof of Corollary 8.1, we have actually proven that $\text{Holant}(EQ_1, EQ_2, EQ_3|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U}) \equiv_{\text{AP}} \text{Holant}(EQ_3|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$. A similar argument shows that $\text{Holant}(EQ_1, EQ_2|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$ and $\text{Holant}(EQ_2|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$ are AP-equivalent. Since $\#CSP_2^*(\mathcal{F})$ is, as shown in Section

2.3, essentially the same as $\text{Holant}(EQ_1, EQ_2|\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{U})$, we immediately obtain the desired claim.

(2) For the second claim, we want to establish *two* AP-reductions between $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F})$ and $\text{Holant}(EQ_2|\mathcal{F})$.

(i) In the first step, we prove that $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F})$ is AP-reducible to $\text{Holant}(EQ_2|\mathcal{F})$. Let $\Omega = (G, \mathcal{F}', \pi)$ be any signature grid given as an input instance to $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F})$ with $G = (V, E)$. Let us define a new bipartite signature grid $\Omega' = (G', \{EQ_2\}|\mathcal{F}', \pi')$ as follows. For each edge (v, w) incident on both nodes v and w in G , we add a new node u labeled EQ_2 and replace (v, w) by an edge pair $\{(u, v), (u, w)\}$. Let V'_1 denote the set of all such newly added nodes and let V'_2 equal V . Let π' be obtained from π by assigning EQ_2 to all the new nodes. A new edge set E' is obtained from E by the above replacement. Clearly, $G' = (V'_1|V'_2, E')$ forms an undirected bipartite graph. It is not difficult to show that $\text{Holant}_{\Omega'} = \text{Holant}_{\Omega}$. Therefore, it holds that $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \text{Holant}(EQ_2|\mathcal{F})$.

(ii) In the second step, we will show that $\text{Holant}(EQ_2|\mathcal{F}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \text{Holant}(\mathcal{F})$. Fundamentally, we do the opposite of (i), starting from a bipartite signature grid Ω' . More precisely, for any node in V'_1 , which is labeled EQ_2 , we delete it and replace each edge pair $\{(u, v), (u, w)\}$ by a new edge (v, w) . This defines a new signature grid Ω . Since $\text{Holant}_{\Omega} = \text{Holant}_{\Omega'}$ holds, we obtain an AP-reduction: $\text{Holant}(EQ_2|\mathcal{F}) \leq_{\text{AP}} \text{Holant}(\mathcal{F})$. $\square$

The computational complexity of exactly solving Holant problems $\text{Holant}^*(\mathcal{F})$ was completely classified by Cai et al. [3, 4] under polynomial-time Turing reductions; on the contrary, it is not known that a similar classification holds in the case of approximate counting under AP-reductions.

References

- [1] J. Cai and P. Lu. constraint theory in holographic algorithms. In *Proc. of the 19th International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC 2008)*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, Vol.5369, pp.568–579, 2008.
- [2] J. Cai and P. Lu. Holographic algorithms: from arts to science. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 77 (2011) 41–61.
- [3] J. Cai, P. Lu, and M. Xia. Holant problems and counting CSP. In *Proc. of the 41st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC 2009)*, pp.715–724, 2009.
- [4] J. Cai, P. Lu, and M. Xia. Dichotomy for Holant^* problems of Boolean domain. Preprint, 2010.
- [5] N. Creignou and M. Hermann. Complexity of generalized satisfiability counting problems. *Inform. and Comput.* 125 (1996) 1–12.
- [6] N. Creignou, S. Khanna, and M. Sudan. *Complexity Classification of Boolean Constraint Satisfaction Problems*. SIAM Press, 2001.
- [7] V. Dalmau and D. K. Ford. Generalized satisfiability with limited concurrences per variable: a study through Δ -matroid parity. In *Proc. of the 28th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2003)*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol.2747, pp.358–367, 2003.
- [8] M. Dyer, A. Frieze, and M. Jerrum. On counting independent sets in sparse graphs. *SIAM J. Comput.* 31 (2002) 1527–1541.
- [9] M. E. Dyer and C. S. Greenhill. The complexity of counting graph homomorphisms. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 17 (2000) 260–289. Corrigendum appeared in *Random Structures and Algorithms* 25 (2004) 346–352.
- [10] M. Dyer, L. A. Goldberg, C. Greenhill, M. Jerrum. The relative complexity of approximating counting problems. *Algorithmica* 38 (2004) 471–500.
- [11] M. Dyer, L. A. Goldberg, M. Jalsenius, and D. Richerby. The complexity of approximating bounded-degree Boolean $\#$ CSP. In *Proc. of the 27th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS 2010)*, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics, pp.323–334, 2010.
- [12] M. Dyer, L. A. Goldberg, and M. Jerrum. The complexity of weighted Boolean $\#$ CSP. *SIAM J. Comput.* 38 (2009) 1970–1986.
- [13] M. Dyer, L. A. Goldberg, M. Jerrum. An approximation trichotomy for Boolean $\#$ CSP. *J. Comput. System Sci.* 76 (2010) 267–277.
- [14] T. Feder. Fanout limitations on constraint systems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 255 (2001) 281–293.
- [15] K. Ko. *Complexity Theory of Real Functions*. Birkhauser, Cambridge, MA, USA, 1991.
- [16] R. E. Ladner. On the structure of polynomial time reducibility. *J. ACM* 22 (1975) 155–171.
- [17] T. J. Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *Proc. of the 10th ACM Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'78)*, pp.216–226, 1978.
- [18] L. G. Valiant. The complexity of enumeration and reliability problems. *SIAM J. Comput.* 8 (1979) 410–421.
- [19] L. G. Valiant. Accidental algorithms. In *Proc. of the 47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS 2006)*, pp.509–517, 2006.

- [20] L. G. Valiant. Holographic algorithms. *SIAM J. Comput.* 37 (2008) 1565–1594.
- [21] T. Yamakami. Approximate counting for complex-weighted Boolean constraint satisfaction problems. Available at [arXiv:1007.0391](https://arxiv.org/abs/1007.0391). An older version appeared in *Proc. of the 8th Workshop on Approximation and Online Algorithms* (WAOA 2010), Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, Vol.6534, pp.261–272, 2011.
- [22] T. Yamakami and A. C. Yao. $\text{NQP}_{\mathbb{C}} = \text{co-C} = \text{P}$. *Inf. Process. Lett.* 71 (1999) 63–69.